

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1322475

EVOLUTION
IS IT
PHILOSOPHICAL, SCIENTIFIC
OR
SCRIPTURAL?



BY
ALEXANDER HARDIE



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

263
+2

EVOLUTION

*Is it Philosophical, Scientific
or Scriptural?*

By

REV. ALEXANDER HARDIE, A.M.

*Methodist Episcopal Church
of the
Southern California Conference*

Los Angeles, Cal.

The TIMES-MIRROR Press

1924

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Copyright, 1924, by
ALEXANDER HARDIE
Los Angeles, California

This Book
Is Respectfully Dedicated to All Lovers
of
THEISTIC PHILOSOPHY,
SANE SCIENCE AND DIVINE REVELATION
by
ALEXANDER HARDIE

P R E F A C E

"The Knowledge of Error is not Learning."

All must admit that recently science has made immense contributions to the material interests of humanity. But science must not, like the unthinking horse which rushes into the battle, thoughtlessly invade the supernal realms of the Omnipotent, the Omniscient and the Omnipresent; for above all, beneath all, and beyond all is the Absolute, Eternal Personality, infinite in power, wisdom and goodness. Also, it must be remembered that while He has bestowed upon plants, animals and men the powers of propagation, He has never endowed any creation or creature with that incommunicable attribute, the power to create. Even philosophy demands that there should be only One Infinite. Therefore, necessarily, according to both reason and Scripture, there can be only One Creator, consequently, plants cannot make animals and animals cannot make men.

Of course Satan's explanation of the Cosmos by unscientific assumptions about creative power having been given (but who was the giver?) to plants and animals—this senseless assumption has always been accepted by infidels and the baser sort of heathen; but never by the Christian Church.

Now, this book is written to show that Evolution—which is the most common and the most degrading manifestation of materialism—that Evolution is utterly unphilosophical,

unscientific, and unscriptural. The further purpose is to save our dear school children and students from the mental and moral defilements of this "*Mud Philosophy*."

"This is the slaughter of an ugly theory by beautiful facts" and "not the slaughter of a beautiful theory by ugly facts."

The kind offices and Christian sympathies of all good citizens are earnestly and respectfully solicited that this great, miserable educational heresy may speedily be banished from our schools, colleges and churches, and that the Holy Scriptures with their beautiful and divinely inspired account of our creation in the "image" and "likeness" of our Heavenly Father, may be speedily restored to its place of influence in the public schools and that consequently our boys and girls may be found, not in the Juvenile Court, but in the Church and Sunday School.

ALEXANDER HARDIE

1194 West 30th Street

Los Angeles, California

CONTENTS

	PAGES
ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND—Thales, Anaximander	
. Empedocles, etc.....	9-12
Evolutionists, plagiarists of old heathen materialists.....	13

PART I

IS EVOLUTION PHILOSOPHICAL?.....	15
Xenophanes, Anaxagoras, etc.....	15-18
Socrates, moralist, theist, opposed evolution.....	19-26
Plato, who wrote Dialogues of Socrates, opposed evolution....	26-33
Aristotle, the great author, believed in God and immortality....	33-37
Evolutionists ignore these famous philosophers.....	37-39
The Cercopes were changed into monkeys by Zeus.....	39
The Sufficient Reason and the Efficient Cause lacking.....	42-47
Who "hangeeth the earth upon nothing."—Job 26:7.....	43
Spencer unphilosophical. Heredity and environment.....	47-53
False gods. Ex. 34:15, Lev. 20:5, Judges 2:17, I Chron. 5:25...	53-55
The So-Called Christian Evolutionist. Professor James.....	56-61

PART II

IS EVOLUTION SCIENTIFIC?.....	63
Quotations from Dawson's "Modern Ideas of Evolution".....	63-65
Dawson's Summary. His important statements.....	65-69
Scholars are Renouncing Evolution.....	69-71
Molecules, Chemistry, Crystallography, Radium, Crystals.....	71-78
Wireless Telegraphy, Meteorology, Botany, Biology.....	78-83
Invertebrate Zoology, by Van Cleave.....	83-88
The Human Ear.....	83-91
Psychology, by James. Memory, perception, reasoning, etc....	91-104
Psychology, by Calderwood. Anthropology.....	104-112
Science not Authoritative. Talleyrand and Lepaux.....	114-120
Embryology. Downward Trend of Humanity.....	120-125
The Failure of Evolution.....	125-128
The Sanskrit Language.....	128-140
Apostate Science. God is not unknowable.....	140-141

The Holy Scriptures make Him known. Jno. 7:17, Jno. 8:28.	141-146
Astronomy. Diameter of our Solar System is about 5,580,- 000,000 miles. To our nearest stellar neighbor is 27,900,- 000,000,000 miles. Our earth and sun travel $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles a second towards Vega in Lyra.....	146-149
Light travels 186,000 miles per second.....	150
See Job 26:7, 8, 11-14 and Ps. 8:3, 4, also Job 38:4-7.....	153-154
Effects of Evolution on Scientists—Darwin, Romanes, Her- bert Spencer, Hæckel, Nietzsche, etc.....	155-162
Debasing influence of Evolution.....	162
Kant's Postulates of Practical Reason, Agassiz.....	164-169
The Evil Influences of Evolution in General.....	172-181
What are the Believers in Evolution?.....	181
Complaints of Students about Teachers and Text-Books.....	183
Virchow, Professors Bateson, Green, Townsend, Saints Peter and Paul.....	185
The 23rd chapter of Matthew on false teachers.....	187

PART III

IS EVOLUTION SCRIPTURAL?.....	194
Margoliouth, Orr, Green.....	195-197
Genesis, 1st and 2nd verses—Creation of Matter.....	197-200
Verses 3-5—The First Period—The Creation of Light.....	201-203
Verses 6-8—The Second Period—The Firmament.....	203
Verses 9-13—The Third Period—Earth, Seas, Land, Grass.....	204
Verses 14-19—The Fourth Period—Sun, Moon, Stars.....	206
Verses 20-22—The Fifth Period—Creation of Fish and Fowl.....	207
Verses 24 and 25—The Sixth Period—Cattle.....	209
Verses 26-28—The Creation of Man.....	210
Gen. 2:7—Man's body earthy and his soul God-breathed.....	212
Gen. 2:21-23—Instantaneous Creation of Eve.....	215
Wesley not an Evolutionist.....	216-218
Man a recent creation.....	221
Anxious evolutionists and mistaken proofs.....	221-223
Meeting in Albert Hall, London.....	223
Christians should be thoughtful.....	224
Theistic Evolution and Ignorance.....	227-229
Decline of Evolution, Dr. Hague.....	230
Evolution a manifestation of depravity.....	232

EVOLUTION

ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It is generally well at the beginning of a discussion to state the question. Consequently, here follow definitions of *Evolution* by several well-known authors:

E. D. Cope, a universally acknowledged authority on the subject, says: "The doctrine of evolution may be defined as the teaching which holds that creation has been, and is, accomplished by the energies which are intrinsic in evolution, without the interference of agencies which are external to it."

Prof. W. H. Conn, an accredited authority on the question, says: "The essential idea which underlies the whole theory is that species have had a natural, rather than a supernatural, origin."

Le Conte says: "Evolution is (1) progressive change (2) according to certain laws (3) by resident forces."

Haeckel says: "The best definition of evolution is, the non-miraculous origin and progress of the universe."

Dr. Lyman Abbot says: "Evolution is the doctrine that this life of man, this moral, this ethical, this spiritual nature has been developed by natural processes."—See in Bible Champion articles by Professor L. T. Townsend, LL.D., Frank J. Boyer, publisher, Reading, Pa.

The mind of man naturally investigates concerning the origin of things. Whence came this world? and whence have we come? are among the leading questions of all ages and nations. Many wish to know the truth about the origin of the world, of life and of man. Various answers have been given to these questions. The egg idea of origins held by the idolatrous Egyptians, indicates that they were evolutionists. But the Incas of South America "called themselves the children of the Sun, and regarded Manco Capacos the head of their

race," and claimed, or the people claimed for him, "descent from the sun-god."—South America, by Bishop D. B. Neely, p. 47. According to their mythology the Japanese have descended from a god and a goddess named respectively Izanangi and Izanami. These later ideas of origins are vastly superior to those of both ancient and modern materialists.

The Greeks in the early centuries of their mental awakening tried hard to explain the deep mysteries of the Cosmos and of the human race. Hesiod, who flourished about 800 B. C., near the time of Homer, wrote, it is supposed, a Theogony which gives an account of the world and the birth of the gods, explaining the whole order of nature in a series of genealogies. His cosmogony "afterwards served as the groundwork for the various physical speculations of the Greek philosophers." His hero-ogony was "an account of the heroes born to mortal mothers whose charms had drawn the immortals from Olympus."—¹Smith, pp. 441-2. No doubt priests and bards helped to form the classical mythological lore of antiquity. But sublimer speculations inspired poets and philosophers to theistic conceptions.

Our present-day evolutionists pride themselves on being "up-to-date"—on being of recent date. But examine their claims to originality and modernity.

Thales, who lived about 600 B. C., regarded water as "the first principle, the universal substratum, of which the other bodies are merely manifestations." This doctrine is the old Aryan myth of the heavenly Okenos translated into scientific language: the water of the storm-cloud fructifies the earth and is the father of all living things."—²Weber, p. 21. It must be remembered that Thales speculated amid the dense darkness and ignorance of old heathen materialism.

According to *Anaximander*, a "disciple of Thales and the author of a work *On Nature*, the first principle is not water, but the infinite atmosphere. . . . The first animals were produced in the water, and from them the more advanced species gradually arose. Man sprang from the fish."—Weber, pp. 22, 23.

¹All quotations from Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, will be known by simply mentioning *Smith and the page*.

²Weber will stand for his History of Philosophy.

Does it not appear that this ancient heathen Anaximander had a finer aesthetic taste than his modern *up-to-date* plagiarists? He was considerate enough to give us a *nice clean* fish ancestry, while our Darwins, Spencers, *et alii* rudely affirm that we came from unsavory monkeys, apes, etc., etc. Further, the Creator Himself puts fish among clean animals, while these other beasts were unclean abominations in His worship. Yet this little freak of originality, by our *great* scientists and philosophers, in putting a hairy Simian for a fine fish must be regarded as *scientific evolution*.

The next ancient philosopher is *Anaximines*. He had personal intercourse with the two preceding philosophers, and was the teacher of Anaxagoras, B. C. 480, and "must have lived to a great age." He endeavored to account "for the phenomena of the universe" and considered air to be the first cause of all things, the primary form, as it were, of matter, into which the other elements of the universe were resolvable."—Smith, p. 166.

"*Heraclitus*, who, on account of his love of paradox, was called the Obscure, flourished at Ephesus, near the end of the sixth century," B. C. His great element, he "sometimes calls fire and sometimes warm breath." "Everything that exists is derived from it, and strives to return to it; every being is transformed fire; and, conversely, every being may be, and, as a matter of fact, is, eventually changed into fire."—Weber, p. 33. "Thus, then, the world is formed, 'not made by God or man,' but simply evolved by a natural operation from fire, which also is the human life and soul, and, therefore, a rational intelligence guiding the whole universe." He said, further, concerning this "primary fire," "it constantly changes itself into a new phenomenon."

"That 'the Creator *amuses* himself by making worlds,' is an expression attributed to *Heraclitus*."—Smith, p. 392. It appears that even this "typical pessimist of antiquity" is superior in his theistic thinking to our up-to-date evolutionists; for they cautiously speak of the creation of a few primordial germs; but he speaks of a Creator so great that He "*amuses Himself by making worlds*." Thus even in the presence of benighted heathen notions of God, modern evolution shows the insignificance of its ideas in mentioning the creation of a few germs.

But evolutionists have another most noted ancestor, *Empedocles*, a mighty champion with pompous pretensions. His "four primal divinities" were "fire, water, air, earth," and "his two divine beings or powers" were "love and hatred." He certainly was one of the most noted of the early Greek evolutionists, and was probably boasting of himself when he said: "An immortal god and no longer a mortal man, I wander among you, honored by all, adorned with priestly diadems and blooming wreaths; to whatever illustrious town I go, I am praised by men and women, and accompanied by thousands, who thirst for deliverance, some being desirous to know the future, others remedies for diseases." This vain-glorious philosopher "promises remedies against the power of evil and old age; he pretends to teach men how to break the vehemence of the unwearied winds, and how to call them forth again; how to obtain from dark rainy clouds useful drought, and tree-feeding rivers from the drought of summer."—Smith, p. 12. He could not, as some imagine, have spoken thus of some "infant science." It has been said that "he proclaimed himself to be a god." Indeed, there were many cases of self-deification in ancient times.

Also, strange legends are "told of his disappearance from among men. Empedocles, according to one story, was one midnight after a feast held in his honor, called away in a blaze of glory to the gods; according to another, he had only thrown himself into the crater of Aetna, in the hope that men finding no trace of his end, would suppose him translated to heaven. But, if so, his hopes were blasted by the volcano which cast forth one of his brazen sandals, and betrayed his secret."¹

According to this pretender there are "four ultimate elements, four primal divinities, of which are made all structures in the world. These four elements are eternally brought into union, and eternally parted from one another, by two divine beings or powers, love and hatred—an attractive and a repulsive force."—²En. B. "As the elements [his deities] entered into combinations, there appeared quaint results—heads without necks, arms without shoulders. Then as these

¹Biographical History of Philosophy, by Lewes, p. 87.

²En. B. will stand for the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

fragmentary parts met, there were seen horned heads on human bodies, bodies of oxen with men's heads, and figures of double sex." *Of course, these were some "missing links" in transition stages.* "It is impossible not to see in this theory a crude anticipation of the 'survival of the fittest' theory of modern evolutionists." Further, he taught—"As man, animal, and plant are composed of the same elements in different proportions, there is an identity of nature in them all. . . . Hence the precepts of morality are with Empedocles largely dietetic."—En. B. p. 345.

Whatever we may think of these legends, still Empedocles stands out on the page of history as an arch deceiver and pompous pretender, and as one of the most prominent propagators of this old antiquated heathen evolution. He is the noted believer in the "four primal *divinities* of which are made all structures in the world, fire, water, air, earth," and of the "two *divine beings* or powers, love and hatred." Nevertheless, this fraudulent, mendacious heathen materialist must be acknowledged as the *patron saint* of our modern evolutionists—a suitable ancestor.

His ungrateful materialistic progeny, our "up-to-date" evolutionists, have taken great credit to themselves for their originality. But of what have they been original? Any reader of Greek philosophy knows that the material theory of the origin of things was advocated by the baser sort, mentally and morally, of the old heathen philosophers who lived about 2,400 years ago, in the dark dawn of Greek learning. Yet uninformed persons imagine that they are reading recently propounded hypotheses, when in fact they are wasting their time over old heathen discarded speculations that were rotting into oblivion when Socrates was born. The evolution of today is nothing more nor less than just a common plagiarism on antiquated heathen materialism of the oldest and *lowest type*. But we must not be too severe upon our modern plagiarists. They were just bedazzled and bewildered especially by this pompous and hypocritical Empedocles, a deluded pretender to deification. The fact for all sane lovers of true philosophy to keep in mind is this: Recent evolution is only a revival of the degrading ideas of antiquated heathenism.

Concerning theories and books it is well to take into consideration the personal equation—what kind of person or persons are primarily interested and responsible? In this case, they are evidently of the *baser sort*, intellectually and morally—are the benighted product of a dark atheistic age of the world. Evidently evolution has no reason to be proud of its intellectual ancestry.

PART I

IS EVOLUTION PHILOSOPHICAL ?

"The Highest Subjects demand from us accuracy."

—SOCRATES.

Consequently, our attention is directed to the sane and profound thinkers of learned Greece, who exposed the shallowness of materialism and who, possessing profound wisdom, rose to theistic conceptions of the Cosmos. Xenophanes, Anaxagoras, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were the crown and glory of Greek philosophy. These noble-minded and truth-loving sages, the supreme intellectuals of scholastic Athens in the most famous period of her world renowned mental preeminence as the University of the Nations—these illustrious patrons of sound learning repudiated materialism and philosophically and logically contended for the theistic explanation of all things. A strange fatality must have afflicted some of our modern philosophers and scientists. Were they blind and could not see the brilliant constellations of intellectual and moral worthies that gave lustre to Greece in the fourth and fifth centuries, B. C., and that to this day sit enthroned in the high places of learning and culture throughout the world? Truly our ill-starred and ill-fated modern materialists must have been demented or perverted when they ignored the great philosophers of Greece and perpetrated their plagiarisms upon the benighted heathen evolutionists of the fifth and sixth centuries B. C.

XENOPHANES

"Xenophanes [fl. B. C. 536] is a decided opponent of the national mythology, towards which he assumes a similar attitude to that of the Hebrew prophets who raised their powerful voices against polytheism and its empty conceptions." "With an eloquence that is full of irony," he asserts that "there is one God . . . one only God, comparable to the gods of Homer or mortals neither in form nor in

thought. This God is all eye, all ear, all thought. Being immutable and immovable, he has no need of going about, now hither, now thither, in order to carry out his wishes, but without toil he governs all things by his thought alone." "There is for the thinker but one single being, the All-One, in whom all individual differences are merged."—Weber, pp. 25, 26, 28.

"Xenophanes was universally regarded by antiquity as the originator of the Eleatic doctrine of the oneness of the universe." He was the "*morning star*" of theistic philosophy. He denied that the Deity was originated or perished" . . . and "he strenuously denounced the transference to the Deity of the human form and sins and weaknesses, . . . and inveighed against Homer and Hesiod as the originators of godless myths." . . . "That the Deity was in his view the animating power of the universe, is expressed by Aristotle."—Smith, p. 1295.

This celebrated philosopher as a thinker was far in advance of the above named ancient materialists and of our modern evolutionists. From this illustrious Magna Græcia sage to our present-day *agnostic savants*—*what a degeneration!* It has been stated "that he taught pure monotheism." Here, on the other hand, is a fine example of development from *ignorant materialism* to *enlightened Theism*.

ANAXAGORAS

The next in order is the justly celebrated Anaxagoras, who was born about 499 B. C., and who was the illustrious thinker of his day. His friendship for Pericles, Euripides, and Protagoras, and his profound contempt for the official religion, made it necessary for him to retire to Lampsacus towards the close of his life. He did not believe that matter could change Chaos into Cosmos—only mind could work such a transformation. "It entered the Chaos and disentangled, making the Cosmos out of it." "Anaxagoras is so decided in his assumption that the *nous* [mind] is free and conscious of its action, that he regards the word fate as devoid of meaning." According to Anaxagoras, "the *nous* knows all things past, present and future, and knows them before the organization of matter."—Weber, pp. 48, 50 and 52. He was charged with impiety and was saved from martyrdom only by the

eloquence of Pericles. He now went to Lampsacus where his enemies charged him with "leaning towards the Medes," and "he was condemned to death." "He is said to have received the intelligence of his sentence with a smile, and to have died at Lampsacus at the age of seventy-two."—Smith, p. 162. Thus, like Socrates and Paul, he joined "the noble army of martyrs." In both life and death how unlike was this theistic philosopher to the ancient heathen materialists and to our modern Christless agnostics! He was a martyr for truth in a dark age of the world's history. His memory was greatly honored as the following lines will show:—

"This tomb the great Anaxagoras confines,
Whose mind explored the heavenly paths of Truth."

Philosophy may be regarded as "the thinking view of things." In the material world it may be called the search after "the efficient cause," and in the mental realm, the search after "the sufficient reason." But in its fuller meaning, Philosophy is the search after the unity of the Universe in the Supreme Being. Consequently, Philosophy in its widest range, is of limitless significance. However, under an agnostic professor, a student might well say that "Philosophy is a pompous parade of prolix perplexities."

Now, it may be asked, "Who is the Supreme Being?" It has been answered that He is "the multiple of the infinites." But who can tell us what that means? The two well-known infinites are time and space. Just try to multiply infinite time by infinite space, and—what is the product? Yes, multiply numberless millions of stellar spaces by an equal number of æons of time, and how would you state the result? Evidently this definition is absurd; for the attempt is made to define a living Personality in terms of two infinite nothings; for philosophers rightly regard time and space, *per se*, as nothings in themselves. The inanity of this definition can be plainly shown. Let x equal time and y equal space, then x multiplied by y equals God. But, according to all normal reasoning, space is nothing and time is nothing; therefore, the equation should read $0 \times 0 = \text{God}$. For nothing multiplied by nothing gives nothing; therefore, nothing is equal to God; that is, God is nothing, and that is just about what

these evolutionists make God to be—practically nothing in His own Universe.

But thanks be to the Good Lord, in reverent and sensible language, there can be presented to the thoughtful person a fairly clear and comprehensive idea of the Supreme Being, the Great First Cause of all. It is not difficult to apprehend the following description or definition: *God is an Absolute and Eternal Person infinite in power, wisdom and goodness.* And certainly it is quite reasonable to define Philosophy as the search after the unity of the Universe in this all-glorious Personality.

AGAIN, LET IT BE ASKED—IS EVOLUTION PHILOSOPHICAL?

It has been truly said: "A little philosophy takes us away from God; a great deal brings us back to Him." The poet Pope says:

*"A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring:
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again."*

This is finely illustrated by the philosophers of antiquity. The shallow-minded and benighted heathen like Thales, Anaximander and Heraclitus, "the typical pessimist of antiquity"—these original propagators of this irrational evolution were vastly inferior in every respect to Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, who philosophically opposed materialism and advocated with transcendent ability and learning the theistic origin of the Cosmos.

It has been shown that in the dark period of Greek heathenism, evolution took its rise, and was propagated amid ignorance and superstition. Also, it can be shown that evolution is still with the benighted and depraved. We know, and without fear of successful contradiction, affirm that now, as always, the ignorant, the vicious and the godless, the agnostic, the infidel and the atheist are the evolutionists of today. Also, at present these modern evolution zealots are just as benighted as their intellectual ancestors were 2,500 years ago, and are still propagating their old unscientific heresies.

SOCRATES

Athens was world-renowned for her orators, poets and philosophers. Socrates, who was born about 469 B. C., was doubtless the greatest heathen moralist—if he may be called a heathen who was so truly theistic in his beliefs—that the world has ever seen. “Socrates wrote no books. He set up no regular school of philosophy. He simply lived constantly in the public frequenting the gymnasia and the market place.”—¹Ch. En., p. 548. It is said that he was acquainted with the philosophy of Anaxagoras, who having “profound contempt for the official religion” of Greece, believed in *Nous* [Mind] that entered the chaos and disentangled it, making a cosmos of it.

Socrates spent his life in personal work among his fellow-countrymen. He was a familiar figure on the streets of Athens, going about doing good to those with whom he conversed. He was a model socialist—not stirring up strife, but promoting all the higher social interests of his beloved Athens in both private and public affairs. In his day he was without doubt the most valuable citizen of the most classic city of the world. In peace he was a lover of good men, and in war he was a brave patriot.

“After the fall of the Thirty Tyrants, Socrates was accused of not believing in the gods of the State, and of corrupting the youth.”—Weber, p. 65. This latter was certainly a false charge. For “he entertained the most lively conviction that he was called by the Deity to strive, by means of his teaching and life, after a revival of moral feeling. To be the physician of souls was, Socrates thought, his divinely appointed duty.”—En. B., p. 335. Truly “Socrates was a man of a sincere and fervent piety.” “No one,” says Xenophon, “ever knew of his doing or saying anything profane or unholy.” He had “a steadfast belief in a Supreme Being, the intelligent and beneficent Creator of the Universe. Inwardly he was, as his friends knew, ‘so pious that he did nothing without taking counsel of the gods.’”—En. B., pp. 332, 333. Further, “Xenophon represents Socrates as using argument from design to prove the existence of the gods.”—Ch. En., p. 550.

¹Ch. En. will stand for Chambers's Encyclopaedia.

Also, "he believed that no one is voluntarily bad; that evil is the fruit of ignorance." "He believed in the supernatural, in superior beings who watch over nations and inspire individuals." Aristotle called him the founder of Ethics. Indeed, "Ethics was the only part of philosophy with which he cared to occupy himself and in Ethics his main doctrine may be summed up in the formula: "Virtue is knowledge; vice is ignorance."—Ch. En., p. 549. Like Xenophanes he would censure Hesiod and Homer because they "attributed to the gods human vices and defects." Socrates was brave in war, but braver still in declaring his unbelief in the unclean heathen mythology of his day. On his trial the great charge against him was this: "He disbelieved the gods of his country and sought to introduce new deities." Though Socrates sought to enlighten men, to teach them how to think correctly and to know the truth, his object was not to make them learned, but to make them useful and happy citizens."—Weber, p. 68.

This great Moralist was a theist—not a materialist, not an agnostic, not an evolutionist. He believed in his *daimon*, his good angel, who told him not to shun death.

On one occasion he said: "I conceive and imagine God orders me to fulfil the philosopher's mission of searching into myself and then men."

On another occasion he said: "For I know that this is the command of God."—¹D. P., Vol. II, pp. 122-3.

"Socrates immediately before he drank the poison developed the grounds of his immovable conviction of the immortality of the soul."—Smith, p. 850. "His last day was spent with his friends, as described in Plato's *Phaedo*, and in the evening he drank the hemlock. 'Such was the end,' Plato makes *Phaedo* say, 'of our friend, whom I may truly call the justest and best of all the men whom I have ever known.'—Ch. En., p. 549.

What a rebuke is this noble-souled Athenian to some of our modern so-called scientists and philosophers who are still blundering on in the darkness of heathen materialism and Anaximander evolution! It is worthy of remark that when Jerusalem was entering its darkest period of apostasy unre-

¹D. P. stands for the Dialogues of Plato, Jowett's Translation.

lieved by any prophet, the Universal Heavenly Father was raising up illustrious witnesses to Himself in the most classic city of all antiquity. No doubt to this lover of truth and martyr for the truth, the God-fearing Socrates, the celestial gates were opened wide. The apostle Peter made a notable announcement to sincere Cornelius and his Gentile friends, when he declared: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."—Acts 10:34, 35. Also, Justin Martyr, the author of an *Apology* of Christianity, taught that the heathen who, not knowing Jesus, lived according to reason, would attain unto "everlasting happiness." The noble-minded Socrates was the great asker of questions, but our Blessed Lord and Saviour was the great answerer of questions—a vastly more difficult and more important office.

This ancient moralist believed in the Scriptural doctrine concerning the ministry of angels and taught: "In like manner God in his love for mankind, placed over us the demons [he meant the angels], who are a superior race, and they with great ease and pleasure to themselves, and no less to us, taking care of us and giving us peace and reverence and order and justice never failing, made the tribes of men happy and united." Evidently, he did not believe in any stone or cave age for man; but according to his worthy conceptions, our primitive ancestors were "happy and united."

His friends also express their opinions.

The following is well said by Cleinias: "Every man ought to make up his mind that he will be one of the followers of God; there can be no doubt of that."—D. P., Vol. V, p. 99.

"The truth is that God is never in any way unrighteous—he is perfect righteousness; and he of us, who is the most righteous, is most like him."—D. P., Vol. IV, p. 235.

"Then Cebes beyond question the soul is immortal and imperishable, and our souls will truly exist in another world." D. P., Vol. II, p. 254.

"But then, O my friend, he said, if the soul is really immortal, what care should be taken of her, not only in respect of the portion of time which is called life, but of eternity! And the danger of neglecting her from this point of

view does indeed appear awful.”—D. P., Vol. II, p. 255. How unlike the low grovelings of our soulless agnostics who imagine they came from animals and who expect to die as the beast dieth!

Again, Socrates: “Those who appear incurable by reason of the greatness of their crimes—who have committed many and terrible deeds of sacrilege, murders foul and violent, or the like—such are hurled into Tartarus which is their suitable destiny and they never come out.”—*Ibid.*, p. 261. This is a true and most solemn Scriptural statement, and shows that Socrates must have had light from the Old Testament, or from the Holy Spirit, or from both.

“I have spoken,” he continues, “many words in the endeavor to show that when I have drunk the poison, I shall leave you to go to the joys of the blessed.”—*Ibid.*, p. 263. Thus this illustrious sage approached death with the calm assurance and triumphant faith of a true believer.

Here is another fine statement: “He then has the first place in happiness who has never had vice in his soul; for this has been shown to be the greatest of evils.”—*Ibid.*, p. 364. Sin leaves its scars and clouds the past with unpleasant memories. A misspent life is a great misfortune for both time and eternity.

Our true hearted moralist did not fawn upon the wicked-rich and great. He says: “Of these fearful examples, most, as I believe, are taken from the class of tyrants and kings and potentates and public men, for they are the authors of the greatest and most impious crimes, because they have the power. And Homer witnesses to the truth of this; for they are always kings and potentates whom he has described as suffering everlasting punishment in the world below.”—*Ibid.*, p. 419.

“Now I, Callicles, am persuaded of the truth of these things, and I consider how I shall present my soul whole and undefiled before the judge in that day. Renouncing the honors at which the world aims, I desire only to know the truth and to live as well as I can, and when I die as well as I can. And to the utmost of my power, I exhort all other men to do the same.”—*Ibid.*, p. 420.

Here follows the dialogue between Socrates and the erring but brilliant and handsome Alcibiades :

Socrates says to him : "He who loves your soul is the true lover."

Socrates further says : "If we have no self knowledge and no wisdom, can we ever know our own good or evil?"—D. P., Vol. II, pp. 502, 505.

Again he says : "Then vice is only suited to a slave?"

"Al. Yes."

"Soc. And virtue to a free man."

"Al. Yes."

"Soc. And, O my friend, is not the condition of a slave to be avoided?"

"Al. Certainly, Socrates."

"Soc. And are you now considering of your state? And do you know whether you are a free man or not?"

"Al. I think I am very conscious indeed of my own state."

"Soc. And do you know how to escape out of a state which I do not even like to name to my beauty?"

"Al. Yes, I do."

"Soc. How?"

"Al. By your help, Socrates."

"Soc. That is not well said, Alcibiades."

"Al. What ought I to have said?"

"Soc. By the help of God."—Ibid., pp. 508-9.

Surely Socrates both mentally and morally attained a vast preeminence over the blind and chaotic-minded philosophers of the preceding two centuries, and over the mentally debased agnostics of our present times.

Socrates taught :—"The highest subjects demand of us the greatest accuracy." How unlike the careless statement of some so-called critics on the all-important matters of our holy Christianity! Infidels seem not to know that importance "demands accuracy." There has been of late an inundation of fallacious inductions—fallacious inductive criticisms of the Holy Scriptures as well as fallacious reasonings concerning science—"science falsely so-called."

Listen again to this large-hearted moralist—"Ought the philosopher to care about the pleasures—if they are to be called pleasures—of eating and drinking?"—D. P., Vol. II, p.

203. This illustrious Athenian attained high spiritual excellence; for to him to do good was more than meat and drink.

There were other noble-minded Athenians. Listen to Aristophanes, who said: "There was a time, I say, when we were one, but now because of the wickedness of mankind God has dispersed as the Acadians were dispersed by the Lacedæmonians."—D. P., Vol. I, p. 562. It is quite probable that this thoughtful citizen had heard in some way of the Babel dispersion. In any case this Athenian had no idea of a stone age, or a cave age, or an arborial age of man. Another friend of Socrates utters truly Christian sentiments about Love. He says: "Thus numerous are the witnesses who acknowledge Love to be the eldest of the gods."—D. P., Vol. I, p. 548.

"For the lover is more divine; because he is inspired by God."—Ibid., p. 550. Aristophanes said this also: "Wherefore let us exhort all men to piety, that we may avoid evil and obtain the good, of which love is the Lord and minister." D. P., Vol. I, pp. 562-3.

Many of the ancient Greeks had fine ideas. Even Hesiod could sing of Chaos, Earth and Love. "Also, Parmenides sings of their generation, saying:

"First of the powers of heaven, he fashioned Love."—D. P., Vol. I, 548.

But see how reverent Socrates was. To a friend he says: "I will come to you tomorrow, Lysimachus, as you propose, God willing." On another occasion he made this fine statement: "To deprive God of Knowledge is monstrous."—D. P., Vol. IV, p. 55. But that is exactly what the Greek materialists did and what our modern agnostics do. How unlike this illustrious Athenian was our modern mentally deluded Spencer with his godless notions about an unknowable Supreme Being!

Now the trial of Socrates was an important historical event. Listen as he utters his farewell counsels and solemn statements to his dear friends.

"And so," he says, "leaving the event with God, in obedience to the law, I now make my defense."—D. P., Vol. II, p. 111.

"But the truth is, O men of Athens, that God is wise!"—*Ibid.*, p. 115.

"A man who is good for anything ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong—acting the part of a good man or of a bad."—*Ibid.*, p. 121.

"I conceive and imagine, God orders me to fulfill the philosopher's mission of searching into myself and men."—*Ibid.*, p. 122.

"Men of Athens, I honor and love you; but I shall obey God rather than you, and while I have life and strength I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy, exhorting any one whom I meet and saying after this manner: 'You, my friend, a citizen of the great and mighty and wise city of Athens, are you not ashamed of heaping up the greatest amount of money and honor and reputation, and caring so little about wisdom and truth and the greatest improvement of the soul, which you never regard or heed at all?'"—*D. P.*, Vol. II, p. 123.

"For I know this is the command of God."

"I do nothing but go about persuading you all, old and young alike, not to take thought for your persons and properties, but first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvement of the soul."—*Ibid.*, p. 123. How like the words of our Blessed Lord in His Sermon on the Mount when He reminds us of His tender care of even "the fowls of the air" and "the lilies of the field."

"Nothing will injure me, not Meletius nor yet Anytus—they cannot, for a bad man is not permitted to injure a better man than himself."—*Ibid.*, p. 124.

"When I say that I am given to you by God, the proof of my mission is this: If I had been like other men, I should not have neglected all my own concerns or patiently seen the neglect of them during all these years, and have been doing yours, coming to you individually like a father or elder brother, exhorting you to regard virtue; such conduct, I say, would be unlike human nature."—*Ibid.*, p. 124.

"Wherefore, O men of Athens . . . either acquit me or not; but whichever you do, understand that I shall never alter my ways, not even if I have to die many times."—*Ibid.*, p.

125. "For I do believe there are gods, and in a sense higher than that in which my accusers believe in them. And to you and to God I commit my cause, to be determined by you as is best for you and me."—D. P., Vol. II, p. 129.

The Loving Lord graciously gave the noble-souled Socrates a happy, peaceful death. After a quiet, sensible, and most Christian-like conversation with his friends—"raising the cup to his lips, quite readily and cheerfully he drank of the poison."

"The chief articles of impeachment were that Socrates was guilty of corrupting the youth [the judges disliked his theistic ideas] and of despising the tutelary deities of the state, putting in their place another new divinity." Socrates immediately before he drank the poison developed the grounds of his immovable conviction of the immortality of the soul. The manner in which the assembled friends in the alternations of joyful admiration and profound grief, lauded him as one who, by divine appointment, was going to a place where it must fare well with him."—Smith, pp. 848-50. "Thus died the man, who of all with whom we were acquainted was in death the noblest, in life the wisest and most just." This martyr died in his unshaken faith in the soul's immortality and in his sublime conceptions of Deity. He stands forth in solitary grandeur as the preeminent moralist and theist of the ancient non-Jewish world. He and Anaxagoras, a worthy predecessor, are among the true immortals. How could any class of men possessing even the rudiments of knowledge, morality and common sense—how could any class of intelligent persons pass by this most illustrious personality that illuminated classic Athens, the university of the nations, with his profound knowledge of men and things and with his celestial teachings concerning the origin and destiny of man?—how could they ignore such a master mind etherialized by divine thoughts? Then how could they mentally cohabit with such insignificant, and base-souled charlatans as Empedocles and his fellow materialists? There are mysteries of stupidity. Is this not one of them?

PLATO

Plato was born in 427 B. C., and may be called the most illustrious aristocrat of the philosophical world; for it was

said that he was a descendant of the god Poseidon [Neptune] through both his paternal and maternal ancestors. Also "the story was current at Athens" . . . that Apollo was the "real father" of the "divine Plato."—Ch. En., p. 227. "His paternal family boasted of being descended from Codrus [an ancient patriotic King of Athens]; his maternal ancestors of a relationship with Solon."—Smith, p. 392.

When about twenty years of age, he became the devoted disciple of Socrates, and he has given a wonderful account of his world-renowned master. For nearly forty years, he taught in the Academy at Athens, and like his master he possessed high moral sensibilities. "Homer and Hesiod were the Greek 'Bible'; but Plato objects to much in these poets and in the popular religion as false and immoral."—Ch. En., p. 231.

"With the psychology of Plato his doctrine of the soul is closely connected. Endowed with the same nature as the soul of the world, the human soul is that which is spontaneously active and unapproachable by death, although in its connection with the body bound up with the appetitive." "The soul when separated from the body,—or the pure spirit,—is immortal, and that a continuance, in which power and consciousness or insight are preserved, is secured to it, Socrates, in the *Phaedo* of Plato, when approaching death, endeavors to convince his friends."—Smith, p. 403.

"Plato, like Socrates, was penetrated with the idea that wisdom is the attribute of the Godhead, that philosophy, springing from the impulse to know, is the necessity of the intellectual man, and the greatest of the goods in which he participates. When once we strive after Wisdom with the intensity of a lover, she becomes the true consecration and purification of the soul. . . . An approach to wisdom, however, presupposes an original communion with *Being* truly so called; and this communion again presupposes the divine nature or immortality of the soul, and the impulse to become like the Eternal. This impulse is the love which generates in Truth, and the development of it is termed *Dialectics*."—Smith, p. 399.

There is an elevation of subject and thought pervading these fine paragraphs that puts into painful contrast the

humiliating and pitiful gropings of our pro-animalizing evolutionists. Plato writes of the soul, immortality and the Godhead, while our blind materialists degrade themselves claiming kinship with beasts and creeping things. Such ideas are really loathsome. Indeed, "Plato used disdainful language towards the materialists."—*The Sophists*, Vol. IV, p. 301. For the profound Plato himself dwelt in realms divine and ascended to thoughts of destinies celestial and supreme.

Plato wrote extensively and his works have come down to us. His Dialogues concerning Socrates contain some of the finest moral teachings of antiquity. The following are doubtless among his genuine writings:—

"1. The *Phaedrus*, which opposes the selfish rhetoric of the Sophists," and has for its chief object "the knowledge of the invisible world."

"2. The *Protagoras* or the Socratic doctrine of virtue."

"3. The *Symposium*" which treats of love—"from sensual love to the philosophical love of beauty, truth, and goodness, as this was personified in Socrates."

"4. The *Gorgias*, the true sage as opposed to the Sophist."

"5. The *Republic*, or concerning the state which realizes the idea of justice."

"6. The *Timæus*, or concerning the nature and origin of the world."

"7. The *Theætetus*, or concerning knowledge and ideas."

"8. The *Phædo*, or concerning the immortality of the soul."

"9. The *Laws*, a work which seems to be a partial retraction of the *Republic*."—Weber, pp. 77 and 78.

The fine tone and elevated range of subject and vision in Plato's writings have caused some to believe "that Plato had drawn from the writings of the Old Testament." But our benighted evolutionists, as a general thing, do not show many signs of mental illumination derived from the sacred pages of the Inspired Volume. "There was also a tradition that Plato was deterred from mentioning the name of Moses as a teacher of the unity of the Godhead, by his fear of the Areopagus."—*Smith's Dict. of Antiquities*, p. 129. It was before the Areopagus which met on Mars' Hill in the open air and which was the most august assembly in Athens, that

Paul made his ever-memorable address which is recorded in Acts, the 17th chapter. No doubt, Jewish synagogues were to be found in the cities of the great empires of antiquity; and each synagogue had its copy of the Old Testament which was publicly read on the Sabbath days. Would not earnest seekers after truth of every nation, as opportunity was given, go and listen to that wonderful Revelation of God? For it answers all our solemn questions and solves the great problems of life. At its fountains the thirsty soul drinks of the water of life, and at its bountiful board the hungry heart is fed with the bread that came down from Heaven. Verily, the Jews were God's missionary nation of antiquity.

Plato believed "that the mind of man cannot wholly unravel the mysteries of the universe." But he "finds the key to the answer in the divine goodness; this enables his thought to pass from the ideal to the real. The Idea is the absolute good; God is supreme goodness. Now the good or goodness cannot but create the good. God is life and life must create life. Hence God must create; the Idea must reproduce itself."—Weber, pp. 92, 98, 99.

This illustrious Athenian taught that "the immortality of the intelligent soul is also proved by the philosopher's desire to be freed from the body and its fetters, and to come into direct communion with the intelligible world." He also believed in the immortality of the soul and held that "immortality, however, is the prerogative of reason."

In another matter this divinely gifted philosopher manifested his superiority. He was a wise patron of the public morality. "The theatre is not permitted in Plato's commonwealth; for it sets before us a world in which good and evil are necessarily intermingled."—Weber, p. 101. This truly patriotic Athenian was more careful about the education of youth than some of us who are living in this, the twentieth century of our Christian era. This is most certainly not to our credit. Our youth are being demoralized by nightly movies, where too often the empty laugh, the foolish jest and smirching joke are the principal entertainments.

The following quotations are taken from the Dialogues of Plato—Jowett's Translation, Vol. V. The speakers are an Athenian stranger and Cleinias, a Cretan:

The Athenian shows "that the holiest life is the happiest" and "that the life which is by the gods deemed to be the happiest is also the best."—p. 42.

The Athenian mourns over disobedience to "father, mother, elders" and rulers, and mentions "the contempt for oaths and pledges, and no regard at all for the Gods."—p. 83.

"Ath. That God governs all things, and that chance and opportunity cooperate with him in the government of human affairs."—p. 91.

The Athenian suggests: "Then let us invoke God as the settlement of our state; may He hear and be propitious to us, and come and set in order the State and the laws."—p. 94. It does appear that here there is implied an expectation of the Coming of the Messiah. Moreover, how vastly superior are the intellectual conceptions of human life and destiny here expressed—superior to the confused and bewildering vagaries of our modern agnostics who are buried in the deep darkness of woeful and wilful ignorance!

Even the Athenian speaks of "a very grievous sort of ignorance which is imagined to be the greatest wisdom."—p. 270. This is pathetically true in our day. In non-Christian colleges, and indeed—sad to say—in some so-called Christian institutions, pretentious professors utterly unlearned in the higher realms of thought and speculation, being ignorant of God and His Holy Word, impose upon young students their vain assumptions against Christianity. Their "impiety arises out of conceit of wisdom," and their ignorances is equaled only by their impertinence concerning sacred things.

The Athenian now states the case of the evolutionists: "They say that fire and water, earth and air, all exist by nature and chance, and none of them by art, and that as to the bodies which come next in order,—earth, and sun, and moon, and stars,—they have been created by means of these absolutely inanimate existences. These elements are severally moved by chance and some inherent force according to certain affinities among them—of hot with cold, or of dry with moist, or of soft with hard, and according to all the other accidental, admixtures of opposites which have been formed

by necessity. After this fashion and in this manner the whole heaven has been created, and all that is in the heaven, as well as animals and all plants, and all the seasons come from these elements, not by the action of mind, as they say, or of any God, or from art, but as I was saying, by nature and chance only.”—D. P., Vol. V, p. 273. The foregoing quotations show that our modern boasted scientists, who have made such a furor during the last half century, were simply plagiarists of the *baser sort* of old materialists who were buried in the dismal ignorance of antiquated heathenism.

Moreover, these ancient evolutionists gave the world another doctrine which our modern tyrants put into bloody practice during the last Great War.

Ath. states: “They are told by them that the highest right is might, and in this way the young fall into impieties, under the idea that the Gods are not such as the laws bid them imagine.” “In the first place, my dear friend, these people would say that the Gods exist not by nature, but by art and by the laws of state . . . and that the principles of justice have no existence at all in nature . . . have no basis in nature, but are of authority for the moment. . . . These, my friend, are the sayings . . . which find their way into the minds of youth. They are told by them that the highest right is might and in this way the young fall into impieties under the idea that gods are not.”—Ibid., p. 274.

“Ath. Well, then, tell me, Cleinias—does not he who talks in this way conceive fire and water and earth and air to be the first elements of all things? these he calls nature, and out of these he supposes the soul to be formed afterwards; and this is not a mere conjecture of ours about his meaning, but is what he really means.” “Then, by Heaven, we have discovered the source of this vain opinion of all these physical investigators; and I would have you examine their arguments with the utmost care, for their impiety is a very serious matter; they not only make a bad and mistaken use of argument, but they lead away the minds of others.”—Ibid., pp. 275-6.

Even these ancient sages saw that this God-denying evolution had a demoralizing influence. In Great Britain it was discovered that this loathsome animal hypothesis had a vitiat-

ing effect upon the youth of the nation. Also, here in America it has sadly lowered the moral tone in our institutions of learning. If school authorities do not protect our students from materialistic teachers and professors, our fine co-education system of education will be imperiled. For ignorance of God endangers the whole fabric of our Christian civilization, and this deification of nature means the ruination of everything sacred—means world demoralization.

This Athenian utters another wise saying: "A very grievous sort of ignorance which is imagined to be the greatest wisdom."—*Ibid.*, p. 270. That is the very kind of ignorance which recently so grievously has affected Europe and America—a boastful ignorance of both God and His Holy Word.

Both Socrates and Plato thought profoundly on the question of knowledge. "Socrates was obliged above all things to show that there was a knowledge independent of the changes of our sensuous affections, and that this knowledge is actually found in our inalienable consciousness respecting moral requirements, and respecting the divinity in conscientious self-intellection."—Smith, p. 400. In a word Socrates did not believe that matter, or as our present-day scientists would say, that molecular action would give us ideas or thoughts. Socrates was so thoroughly sane and theistic that his philosophy always led him into the presence of the Supreme Being.

It is plain that both Socrates and Plato were discovering that man has two sources of knowledge. By perception through his five senses, he perceives the external world. For there is in man an essence or spirit, while about him is the material world. It is his mind which thinks, reasons, and realizes itself. It is both conscious of external objects and is self-conscious of its own existence. Consequently, there are theoretical ideas and practical facts. On the one hand, there is subjective perception, and on the other the objective elements of knowledge. Further, this subjective perceiving intellectual power has a dual ability. Through the senses it perceives external objects and thus acquires a knowledge of them, and besides that power it not only can realize its own existence, but it can also, quite independently of its senses and the external world, conceive thoughts about itself and

the external world. Thus Socrates and Plato were the leaders in the highest realms of thought. The former leading the thoughts of man up into the sublime realms of Theism, and the latter revealing to man the greatness of his own mental nature and its relation to the senses and the external world.

Compared with these ancient philosophers, what groveling creatures our modern materialists are! It is nothing but insanity to try and get the mysterious phenomena of mind out of molecular action. But this matter will be more fully treated in following pages.

When we contemplate the highly intellectual speculations of Socrates and Plato in their conceptions of things in general, we are inspired by their mental acumen and their divine ideas. There is a profundity of thought, a fine range of vision and celestial contemplation of the real and of the ideal. But when we turn to our modern agnostic pretenders to philosophy and listen to their shallow and illogical vagaries concerning the nature and origin of man and his relation to the Deity, there is discovered a most humiliating and appalling mental inferiority—an inferiority which can only be accounted for on the fact of human mental depravity. The theories and hypotheses, the ideas and speculations of our evolutionists are so utterly foundationless and degrading, so utterly vain and vicious, that a normal mind is compelled to question the sanity and even the morality of their origin. It is quite impossible for the evolutionists to conceal their glaring inferiority and insignificance in every respect. Indeed, when a comparison is instituted between these ancient worthies and our modern pretenders to high attainments in philosophy, the latter give ample proof of nothing but degrading inferiority and degeneration. To speak euphemistically, evolution with all its shallow speculations can only be the product of a disordered or a diseased mind.

ARISTOTLE

Aristotle was born 385 B. C., near Athos in Greece. For three years he was the tutor of Alexander the Great. Then for a time he was a disciple of "Plato, who spake of him as the intellect of his school." "In 334 he began to teach his philosophy in the walks of the Lyceum at Athens; hence the name applied to his school, and the epithet given to his dis-

ciples—Peripatetics.” “Philosophy is defined by him as the science of universals.” He taught that the “Supreme Being is pure form and without matter,” and that the “Supreme Being is absolute perfection; hence he contains *no matter for a more exalted being*; in short he is immaterial.” “But he does not accept the pantheistic conception of an absolute that develops, and is matter before form, potentiality before energy.” Here follows an important statement: “If the Supreme Being had first existed in germ and as potentiality, then it would have been necessary for an actual being to exist antecedent to God in order to energize this germ and to make it God actual.” He makes this further statement: “Not capacity but energy, not the potential but the actual, not the imperfect but the perfect, is the first principle anterior and superior to everything else. This favorite conception of Aristotle really agrees with the Eleatic doctrine: *ex nihilo nihil*; its logical consequence is the negation of the chaos as the original form of existence, if we may apply the term ‘form’ to the formless as such, or to the complete absence of all order.” Therefore, “the eternal actual Being is both the motive and generating cause, the form and the final goal of things.”—Weber, pp. 104-5, 107, 114-116.

Mark that fine statement: “*The negation of chaos as the original form of existence.*” For chaos does not possess within itself self-organizing forces. The Eleatic doctrine is true: *ex nihilo nihil*—“from nothing, nothing.” The learned Aristotle, who was gifted with one of the greatest intellects ever bestowed upon a mortal, saw the absurdity of beginning with chaos and then expecting primordial germs to work themselves up into higher realms, to create superior forms of life and new laws for their development, and to select from myriads of mysterious molecules the right ones and arrange and correlate them properly; in a word, for a germ to endow itself with all the wonderful attributes of human and even Divine personality—Aristotle had no place for such monstrous absurdities. Some may mildly call such notions theories; but it is evident that they are only irrational hypotheses which our so-called scientists of late have been frantically propagating.

Again, this profound thinker taught that "the Supreme Being is immaterial" and "that God is pure intelligence."—*Ibid.*, p. 117. Here is one of his profound statements: "There can be no infinite series of causes; we are obliged to stop at a first mover." The theory of an infinite series of effects and causes without a first cause "violates one of the most fundamental laws of thought." "Moreover, the first cause acts forever, and the ensuing is likewise eternal."—*Ibid.*, 116. The little child in its simplicity and ignorance may ask, "Who made God?" But if a grown person should ask such a question, he deserves to be told the myth about Atlas carrying the world on his back. The thoughtful and reverent mind is well satisfied with the answer: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."—Gen. 1:1. The normal mind intuitively rests upon that inspired answer. But our modern materialists have no mental affinities with the grandeurs of the creations of the Almighty.

The great Aristotle, however, dwells among the sublimities and mysteries, and according to him "the divine *nous* [mind] has an immediate intuitive knowledge of the intelligible essence of things."—*Ibid.*, p. 117. That is, God knows things to their last analysis. He is infinitely minute and infinitely vast in His Knowledge. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"—Rom. 11:33. But our antiquated materialists with their groveling thoughts intellectually dwell with worms of the earth, and have only vague conceptions of all the sacred and nobler realities and speculations concerning celestial revelations to our Heaven-blessed humanity.

The illustrious Aristotle has left monuments of his learning and wisdom. "Many regard him as the founder of psychology as a distinct science." "His Ethics and Politics, though apparently less studied, at least less commented on in antiquity than his other works, have in mediæval and modern times exercised an enormous influence."—*Ch. En.*, p. 414.

He "was a man of the highest intellectual powers, gifted with a piercing understanding, a comprehensive and deep mind, practical and extensive views of the various relations of actual life and the noblest moral sentiments."—*Smith*, p. 321. He was a voluminous writer, and "is called the father

of the history of philosophy."—*Ibid.*, p. 334. And he "is the creator of the science of Logic." He wrote on Metaphysics and called it "the first philosophy" and "the science of the first principles and causes of things." According to him metaphysics "occupies itself with that which exists really and absolutely, with that which is eternal and immovable." He believed that "God himself is eternal thought, and his thought is operative, life, action,—it is the thought of thought."—*Ibid.*, 337. "God as the living God is the universe." "The absolute principal is God"—"the highest reason, the object of whose thought is himself."—*Ibid.*, p. 337.

"Like Plato he believed in real universals, real essences, real causes; he believed in the unity of the universal, and in the immateriality of essences; he believed in the good, and that there is a good of the universe; he believed that God is a living being, eternal and best, who is a supernatural cause of the motions and changes of the natural world and that essences and matter are also necessary causes; he believed in the divine intelligence and in the immortality of our intelligent souls; he believed in knowledge going from sense to reason, and that science requires ascent to principles and is descent from principles, and that dialectic is useful to science; he believed in happiness involving virtue, and in moral virtue being a control of passions by reason, while the highest happiness is speculative wisdom."—*En. Br.*, p. 503.

Aristotle wrote well and learnedly on many subjects. His numerous works have been divided into the following classes: Logical, Physical, Miscellaneous, Practical, Art, Historical.—*En. Br.*, pp. 505-6. "But he was primarily a metaphysician, a philosopher of things, who uses the objective method of proceeding from being to thinking."—*Ibid.*, p. 519. He sanely held that—"Ideality and reality are not opposed to each other."—*Smith*, p. 334. According to him, "the individual substances of which the universe is composed, fall into three great irreducible kinds: Nature, God, man."—*Ibid.*, p. 520. He speaks of God as the prime mover of the heavens, but not the creator; for "both Aristotle and Plato regard matter and form as eternal; only the Stagirite [Aristotle] does not conceive the eternity of matter to mean absolute dualism."—*Weber*, p. 112. "But God is no mechanical

mover: He moves as motive. He is the efficient only as the final cause of nature. For God is a living being eternal, very good."—*Ibid.*, p. 520. Even Aristotle with his vast learning and imperial mind in saying that God was not the creator, fell short of the more glorious revelations which are found in the inspired Word of God. Yet he says, God "is the efficient only as the final cause of nature."—*En. Br.*, p. 520.

The Stagirite was an advocate of good government. On this subject, he says:—

"I. Right governments, aiming at the general good:

"1. Monarchy, of one excelling in virtue;

"2. Aristocracy, of a class excelling in virtue;

"3. Commonwealth, of a majority excelling in virtue.

"II. Deviations, aiming at the good of the government:

"1. Democracy, aiming at the good of the majority;

"2. Oligarchy, aiming at the good of the few;

"3. Tyranny, aiming at the good of one."—*Ibid.*, p. 521.

"Such is his practical philosophy, contained in his matured *Nicomachean Ethics*, and his unfinished *Politics*." Aristotelianism is a philosophy of substantial things, and also speculative subjects. He seeks after God and finds Him as the great moving power in the heavens and as the ultimate authority in moral speculation. Yet it has been well said: "*Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam.*"

Aristotle in speaking of the Supreme Being showed that he had no mental affinities with the ancient Greek materialism. This is his definition of God: "The first ground of all being; the divine spirit which, unmoved itself, moves all; absolute, efficient principle; absolute notion; absolute end."

If our *up-to-date* materialists had appropriated the ideas of Anaxagoras or of Aristotle and expanded and emphasized them, they might have rendered service to the thinking world; but for our modern materialist, as *celebrated philosophers and scientists*, to consort intellectually with the benighted heathen Greeks, whose crude speculations were antiquated before the great Aristotle was born—surely such

conduct may well indicate a *collapse of reason*. For sensible men, of moderate mental attainments, under the circumstances, would never go back to the most worthless mental gropings of old blind speculations. Such an act must be classed as a mental lapsus, or aberration, or a freak of human perversity.

Moreover, our modern evolutionists ignored the most brilliant period of Greek history when Phidias, the architect, and Pericles, the statesman, were bestowing beauty and fame upon classic Athens, and when in the market place, in the Academy and in the Lyceum, the most illustrious philosophers of all antiquity were giving illuminating and inspiring instructions on ethics, metaphysics, theism—on subjects pertaining to all the higher realms of human activity and thought. Greece may justly be proud of her famous triad of learned sages, who were men of transcendent ability and profound wisdom, and who stand forth in the learned world as philosophers without peers in all antiquity. One loves to linger with these imperial thinkers and theists who flourished at Athens just before the time of Alexander the Great. They are among the true immortals of world renown. Indeed, it is quite probable that they occasionally visited a Jewish synagogue where their souls were fed by the Word of God and their eyes were enlightened by the glory of the Shechina. "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."—Jno. 1:9.

How could mentally and morally sane persons pass by the most celebrated sages of classic Athens, and enjoy intellectual fellowship with such benighted heathen as Heraclitus who is "the typical pessimist of antiquity," who believed in a *fire universe* which "had no beginning," and who taught the "negation of being" which "likewise implies skepticism"! Is not this a remarkably sad and clear case of "like to like"—ancient heathenism and modern agnosticism?

For about half a century the civilized world has been badly victimized by this miserable animalizing of our God-created and Christ-redeemed humanity. Indeed, this abomination has been thrust upon us *ad nauseam*. For when we compare to the above-named Triad of most illustrious Athenians—when we compare to them intellectually and morally our modern

agnostics, we most certainly *do not find evolution*, but a decided and appalling degeneration. In the noble presence of these world-famous Greeks that have given renown to their age and country, what is Darwin, who acknowledged that *atrophy* had befallen the higher elements of his being; and what is Spencer, whose fallacious reasonings have come to naught and ridicule; and what is Hæckel, who has been branded as a falsifier of photographs and has been dishonored in his own country? These moderns are poor proofs of their assertions that man, unaided by Christianity, naturally develops intellectually and morally, and becomes a noble-souled personality.

Now, while the agnostics can produce no examples of animals becoming men, Greek mythology gives examples of the contrary process. For instance, the following specimens are found in Smith, Vol. I, p. 672: "Cercopes were droll and thievish gnomes, who play a part in the story of Heracles. Their number is commonly stated to have been two, but their names are not the same in all accounts. . . . Diodorus, however, speaks of a greater number of Cercopes. They are called sons of Theia, the daughter of Oceanus. They annoyed and robbed Heracles in his sleep. The place in which they seem to have made their first appearance was Thermopylæ, but the comic poem *Kercopes*, which bore the name of Homer, probably placed them at Oechalia in Eubœa, etc., etc., which derived their name from the Cercopes who were *changed into monkeys by Zeus for having cunningly deceived him.*" This is far more reasonable than the insane speculations of evolutionists.

Ancient Theism is the crown and glory of Greek philosophy, while modern materialism with its loathsome evolution is our intellectual disgrace. Moreover, it is accomplishing the demoralization of the rising generation. Well may base-minded infidels who have ransacked the earth in their vain efforts to find an animal ancestry for themselves—well may their names fade away into unregretted oblivion—*well may their memory rot!* Already a general disavowal is beclouding the unenviable memories of the ill-fated Darwin and Spencer and Hæckel; while an unfading lustre like a halo, rests upon the memory of the forerunners and the successors of the

immortal Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Their names are enshrined in all the classic halls of Christian learning throughout the civilized world. Further, it ought to be said that doubtless the two most overrated men in all literature are Charles Darwin, the base-minded, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, the feeble-minded. Though they were born and educated under Christian influences, yet they closed their minds to "the truth as it is in Jesus." "As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind"—in the margin, "a mind void of judgment."—Rom. 1:28. Consequently, as Paul says (1 Tim. 4:1), "They depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Darwin's name in Westminster Abbey is a desecration of that holy place. Why should the carcasses of infidels be allowed to pollute the sanctuary of the Living God? It is hoped that the rising tide of Christian sentiment will soon demand the removal of this defilement from the Lord's House of Prayer.

The groveling materialist, whose beclouded mind finds congenial speculation in the "mud philosophy," which Carlyle called "the Gospel of Dirt," has vague ideas of all the higher and more sacred realms of human existence, where moral responsibility dictates the right and where emotional felicity approves the good. These ancient sages had fine thoughts on government, ethics, art, literature, and also on celestial things such as immortality, the future state and the Deity. Their consciences dealt honestly and intelligently with ethical problems. Though they may not fully have enjoyed the light of the Mosaic Dispensation, they certainly entered into the Holy Place of the Divine Presence; for all their sublimer reasonings and speculations found rest in Heaven.

But both the ancient and the modern materialists are of the earth earthy. In both thought and speculation they dwell with the worms of the earth and the beasts of the field—and let them continue to study plant and animal life. However, some of them *must launch* out into speculation and philosophize. Now, if Darwin and his collaborators had confined themselves to scientific research in their own domains, though they were agnostics, they might have had honorable mention and memory as scientists. But when they ventured forth into

philosophy and cast aside the Holy Scriptures, propagating vague and unreasonable theories, they justly brought down upon themselves the scorn of philosophy and the righteous indignation of all intelligent lovers of truth, and the stern rebuke of theology. Their sweeping generalizations based on mere suppositions—the phrase, “we may well suppose,” being used by Darwin 800 times—aroused in the minds of thoughtful scientists, philosophers, and Christians a spirit of righteous indignation. Many felt that the good sense of the people was trifled with by evolutionists in using the loosest kind of inductive reasoning. Fallacies were constantly and brazenly pressed into service. Even respectable hypotheses were conspicuous by their absence.

Thus, it is seen that this disgraceful craze for an animal ancestry was built up on nothing but *suppositions*. Consequently, it requires very little learning or courage to defy the animalizing evolutionists—these agnostics, infidels and atheists; these benighted materialists—to give philosophical data for evolution. In the after-parts of this book it will also be shown that it has neither scientific nor Scriptural data. It is amazing that this intellectual inanity has had such a rage in our country and has so sorely afflicted our schools. All unbelievers are making frantic efforts to propagate this man-dishonoring and God-denying, Satanic explanation of the Cosmos to the mental and moral debasement of the rising generation. Slanderers of our divine humanity!

Even tyrannical Napoleon had sense enough to say to the deists, the infidels of his day, that they made up “for not believing in God, by believing everything else.” Recently in Germany, England, and in our own country, skepticism has been aggressive, and some professors of religion and some professors of learning have been “tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.”—Eph. 4:14. But throughout Christendom the great body of the people has not lost common sense and still prefers the beautiful Garden of Eden account of our creation to the miserable “mud philosophy,” or any amœba-supposition-science of the ungodly. The intelligent and thoughtful are

retaining their faith in their Creator's Holy Inspired Word concerning our origin and the glorious verities of Christianity.

It is now proper to ask for

THE SUFFICIENT REASON AND THE EFFICIENT CAUSE

Does materialism, from a philosophical point of view, present a sufficient reason? or from a scientific point of view furnish an efficient cause?

In answer to these questions it is axiomatic to say that *everything must have a cause and that no result can transcend its cause*. Examine the pretensions of this antiquated evolution which has been palming itself off as something quite *up-to-date* in science. Begin with its material phases and see if efficient causes can be found for the wonderful results which are mentioned by materialists with a great show of confidence. Superficial minds in their unthinking way are apt to accept material causes for the Cosmos. But the deep-hearted and noble-minded of all nations, who have sincerely followed the light of nature in their search after an efficient cause, will be led into the Presence of the Great Creator. It has been shown that the wiser ancients readily discerned that *ex nihilo nihil fit*—"From nothing, nothing can come." Therefore, matter did not create itself. To assert that it did is absolutely irrational. But matter is here, and, according to the common belief, the Supreme Being is here, and the important questions are these: Did matter make God, or did God create matter? This is the crux of the whole question.

Happily the facts of human experience give a clear, definite and rational answer. In our dual being mind and matter are so mysteriously correlated that there is only one personality. Then, in the individual person, as a general rule, which is the prime factor? Is it mind, or is it matter? In the normal person does the mind govern the body, or does the body govern the mind? Except among the abnormal, those over whom the passions run riot, the physical nature is not in control. Indeed, it is universally conceded that—"*the mind is the man,*" and that the body is only the tenement of the soul. The mind, then, is that spiritual something within us which thinks and reasons, which discerns and

knows, which has an intuitive sense of right and wrong, and which responds to *the ought* and *the ought not*. It is that *dominating* presence within which constitutes our proper personality, and to which our material body automatically and spontaneously renders obedience and service. This proves that the mind is the superior part of our nature.

Further, the supposition that matter is eternal has been shown to be unreasonable. It has been well said that the molecule bears the stamp of being a "manufactured article." Wisdom is seen everywhere in wonderful adjustments—the wing of the bird to air, the fin of the fish to water, the eye to light, the ear to sound. Also, the mineral kingdom feeds the vegetable kingdom, while it in turn feeds the animal kingdom. Suitable food has been prepared for the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air and the beasts of the field. These wonderful provisions and adjustments—and millions more could be mentioned—prove that power, wisdom and goodness have been exercised.

Then, do not the mountains and the oceans speak of wisdom and power? Who laid the foundations of the earth in the great deep? Who "stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing"?—Job 26:7. Who created the light and sent it forth to illuminate this vast universe? Who bringeth out the constellations in their season? Who marshals the hosts of heaven, and who guides the planets in their courses? Whence came the wonderfully balanced centripetal and centrifugal forces which keep the planets in their orbits? This whole Universe with its myriads of wonders and its numberless and vast constellations proclaims that their Author must be a Being of infinite power.

Also, this Author must possess infinite goodness. Who can look up into the heavens in a starry night and see Orion in his splendour, Sirius in his solitary grandeur and the Milky Way—"the Way of the Gods"—and not be filled with wonder and reverence? and not be moved to worship and adoration? We are living in a universe where benign influences encompass us on every side. *There is a bright side to life*. There is more light than darkness; there are more balmy breezes than driving storms, and smiling nature seldom

frowns; the pleasant days far outnumber those of gloom. This is a world of beauty and plenty, naturally overflowing with the joys of life, pouring out its gladness in music and song. Everywhere riches are stored up for man—in the waters, in the earth, and in the hills. Let the eyes range over the rich valleys covered with golden grain, and let the beholder inhale the sweet perfume of myriads of variegated flowers as they adorn the face of the landscape. Well might the poetic Greeks call the earth—*Cosmos*—which means beautiful. We live in a world where “every prospect pleases, and”—sad to say!—“only man is vile.” It is sin that causes suffering and mars the “image” of God in fallen man. Sin is both the curse and the disgrace of this glorious creation of the All-Father. But the world itself shows that it is the work of infinite goodness. Then since every star, every planet, and every atom of this beautiful world on which we live, shows unmistakable marks of beneficent design in its structure, laws and relations—these facts compel us philosophically to conclude that the Universe had a Mind origin and that *matter is neither eternal nor self-created*.

Therefore, since matter is not eternal, since *from nothing nothing comes*, and since it is a fact of human experience that when mind and matter are united as in human personality, mind takes precedence; it necessarily follows that the Universe must have had a mind origin. Any other conclusion fails to provide either a *sufficient reason* or an *efficient cause*, and lands us in numberless absurdities.

One finds a confirmation of this in Herbert Spencer’s amazingly absurd definition of evolution: “Evolution,” he says, “is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an independent incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.”—Ch. En., p. 623. The foregoing is just an aggregation of words without any foundation; in fact—without *rime* or *reason*. Of this vain and vague definition, let us ask: Whence came the matter? Whence the laws that govern it? Whence the motion? Many such questions can be asked and not a single one can the *learned philosopher* answer. Indeed, he seems to be blindly oblivious of the

stubborn fact that *effects must be preceded by causes*. Evolution and Christian Science are the finest modern examples of mental imbecility.

In the study of Theism which takes "the thinking view of things," the student makes the search after the unity of the Universe in the Supreme Being. Truly "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy work."—Ps. 19:1. When one considers the stellar spaces and their occupants, the mountains in their majesty, the forests with their leafy temples, the plains where dwell the people in millions; and when one considers the sea with its multitudinous and almost infinite varieties of plant and animal life in algæ and in monsters of the deep—one is "lost in wonder, love and praise," and is compelled by the irresistible force of logic to believe in that glorious Being who is infinite in power, wisdom and goodness. Verily, upon everything in nature is stamped the divine superscription, and the world is held by a golden chain of causes to the throne of the Almighty.

Geology shows that there was a time in the distant past when our planet was a superheated molten mass, *absolutely without life of any kind*. But since there is abundant life on it now, and in multitudinous varieties of plants and animals, the question of its origin on this planet demands an answer.

Then, whence has come this wonderful life in multiplied millions of forms, in the sea, on the land and in the air? Many vain attempts have been made to prove the spontaneous generation of life. But at last even the evolutionists themselves have been compelled to give up the foolish search and now even the agnostics must believe in the Creator, for at least a few primordial germs. But their faith is very feeble, and in their ardent desire to relieve the Almighty from trouble, they are sorely belaboring themselves to find some hairy beasts or scaly fish that could make men. They insanely try to invent and invest simple protoplasm cells with sufficient creative power to people the sea, the land and the air with the wonderful, beautiful and prolific life which now adorns and enriches this whole globe. Furthermore, they supposed—they did not "well suppose" this time—that from Amœbæ, or some

such animals, in due time, came man body and soul. Of course, some difficulties are in the way of this astounding supposition. For a time Darwin's notion about "natural selection" was supposed to have the *magic power*. But at length it dawned upon their perplexed minds that their feeble cause was hardly sufficient to produce such marvelous transformations as to develop plants into animals and animals into human beings.

Then Herbert Spencer propounded his wonder working hypothesis—"the survival of the fittest." This latter phrase was assumed to possess such charm and magic that from some primitive form of life—it might be a tad-pole or some of his kind—behold man did eventually evolve. Now, this preposterous philosopher based his theory largely on a long-time factor, which, it was expected, would make large contributions to the much-desired result—a perfect man.

But scientifically speaking—and these evolutionists make *great pretensions about science*—how much is this time factor worth in real work of any kind? This problem can be expressed in a simple algebraic formula. For instance, let x represent the tad-pole, or some such primitive form of animal life, and y represent vast æons of duration. Then the equation will be $x + y$ equal man. *How amazingly simple!* But as we have already seen, present-day philosophers regard the two infinites, time and space, as nothings *per se*; that is, while everything is in time and space, these in themselves are absolutely nothings. This was the opinion of the celebrated German philosopher, Kant, and in harmony with him is the following statement of Alfred Weber, professor in the University of Strassburg, who has written a fine History of Philosophy: "Hence space and time are intuitions *a priori*" and "not objects of perception, but *modes of perceiving objects*, intuitive habits, inhering in the thinking mind."—Weber, pp. 442-3. Now our equation stands: $x + y$ equal man. But it has been shown that y (time) equals nothing; therefore, the equation is $x + 0$ equal man; that is, tad-pole equals man. What *brilliant philosophers and scientists* have flourished in our day! That human beings of the most moderate mentality and education could be duped by such shallow and fallacious reasoning is almost beyond belief.

Recently a gleam of sanity flitted across the minds of these bewildered evolutionists, and they have given up their boasted "survival-of-the-fittest" slogan. Also heredity and environment have been infinitely overestimated in an insane desire to account for the presence of plants, animals and man on this planet without believing in the Great First Cause.

In looking up the historic background of Evolution, it has been shown that evolution had its origin in the dark period of Greek heathen materialism, and that it was rejected by the most illustrious Athenian sages of the succeeding centuries. But again, even in our day, the ill-begotten theories of old infidelity have made their reappearance, and who are the modern proponents of these antiquated absurdities? Charles Darwin may be called the most prominent scientific advocate of this animalizing theory and Herbert Spencer is its outstanding philosophical propagandist. Spencer vainly asserted that his plan, "the survival of the fittest" would give us *our true, ancient and honorable ancestry*. Now, Darwin was a pervert from Christianity to agnosticism, while Spencer, notwithstanding his important posing, was just a common infidel. But the ambition of the *great scientist* and the *great philosopher* was to make a declaration of the resurrection of our simian ancestors which had been laid to rest over 2,000 years ago by the greatest philosophers of Greece. These facts indicate that this peculiar scientific and philosophic product is simply the progeny of ancient heathenism and modern infidelity.

Our attention is directed to further strange utterances of this irrational philosopher—utterances which are found in his First Principles, and which show how unreliable he was as a thinker.

SPENCER'S PHILOSOPHY

"Respecting the origin of the Universe," he says, "three verbally intelligible suppositions may be made. We may assert that it is self-existent; or that it is self-created; or that it is created by an external agency." "The deeper question, into which this finally merges, is, whether any one of them is even conceivable in the true sense of the word."—First Principles, p. 30. How adroitly he beclouds the issue! The phrase "self-existent" means that matter was eternal, which

is unphilosophical; and the phrase self-created is absurd; but the expression, "created by an external agency," is philosophical, scientific and Scriptural. Indeed, it is the only sane account of the Cosmos. But he doubts "whether any one of these explanations is even conceivable in the true sense of the word." We have seen that the enlightened heathen were wiser than our up-to-date philosopher. They showed that creation has a *very conceivable explanation* in God.

"However imperfectly," Spencer continues, "this higher faith [infidelity] is at first realized, we yet see in altars 'to the unknown and unknowable God,' and in the worship of a God that cannot by any searching be found out, that there is a clearer recognition of the inscrutableness of creation."—*Ibid.*, p. 45. His higher faith, which is infidelity or evolution, has been one of the most abominable *curses of the world*. The wicked do not know God, because they do not want to know Him. But all His saints "know" their Heavenly Father, their adorable Redeemer, and the Holy Spirit their Comforter. Of course, the act of creation in itself is inscrutable, but the *fact of creation* is well within our mental range. Does not duplicity lurk in these statements of Spencer?

"If religion and Science," Spencer says, "are to be reconciled, the basis of this reconciliation must be this deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts—that the Power which the Universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable."—*Ibid.*, p. 46. There is no conflict, never was and never will be, between true Religion and true Science; for God Himself is the infinitely wise, powerful and beneficent Author of both; but there always has been and always will be conflict between our Holy Christianity and the miserable hypotheses of "science falsely so called." This erring philosopher wishes Christians to regard God as unknowable, and, therefore, as negligible in our thinking and in our living, and to regard the forces of nature as having no testimony for us as to their Author. In other words, Spencer wishes to make practical nonentities of both God and Religion. Then, of course, his godless philosophy would reign supreme. God forbid!

A Mr. Mansfield writes: "It is our duty, then, to think of God as personal; and it is our duty to believe that He is infinite." Spencer replies: "That this is not the conclusion

here adopted, needs hardly to be said." Our philosopher continues: "If there be any meaning in the foregoing arguments [Mansfield's], duty requires us neither to affirm nor deny personality."—p. 108. This non-personal vagary might please Hindu pantheists and that inanity called Christian Science; but Christians in the very depths of their self-consciousness realize their God-given personality, and believe with all their "heart and mind and soul and strength" in a Personal and living God.

"The certainty," says Spencer, "that on the one hand such a Power exists, while on the other hand its nature transcends intuition and is beyond imagination, is the certainty towards which intelligence has from the first been progressing."—*Ibid.*, p. 108. How true the Holy Scriptures are! "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" for "the world by wisdom knew not God."—1 Cor. 1:20, 21. These perverse intellectuals deny the very fact of consciousness in their own nature; for every human being has an intuitive apprehension of a Deity, a Higher Power. Indeed, the Heavenly Father is revealed in our intuitions, and He places Himself well within the range of our imagination. But these pretentious unbelievers wickedly shut God out of their minds, and then vainly imagine that Christians have no real knowledge of their Heavenly Father.

Again, Spencer affirms: "After it has been shown that every supposition respecting the genesis of the Universe commits us to alternative impossibilities of thought—after it has been shown that every attempt to conceive real existence ends in an intellectual suicide—after it has been shown why, by the very constitution of our minds, we are eternally debarred from thinking of the Absolute, it is still asserted we ought to think of the Absolute thus and thus."—*Ibid.*, p. 110. How can that most sane statement—the Almighty Created this Universe—"commit to alternative impossibilities of thought"? Only a demented psychology which accepts molecular action as an efficient cause for mental phenomena, could so outrage true philosophy. How could any person possessing normal mental faculties declare that our minds were so constituted that human beings were "eternally debarred from thinking of the Absolute"? Certainly the mind that has not committed

intellectual suicide can have ideas, thoughts and concepts of "real existence." Most assuredly, since man was created in the "image" and "likeness of God," his mind was so constituted that he can know his Heavenly Father, the Eternal, the Absolute. We *know* that man can have communion with his Maker. Moses and Elijah and the prophets held converse with the most High. The Holy Scriptures are very clear and full on this subject; for God has revealed Himself in Christ.

This evolutionist philosopher may imagine that he is opening higher realms of thought; but unfortunately he is only emptying the human mind and the Universe of all its glorious realities. He ought to know that molecules are poor thinkers and that their deification only leads from the beauties and the delights of Paradise to the dismal and doleful and dangerous jungle of the "Mud Philosophy," which is the sure sign of mental abnegation. Certainly, the deluded evolutionist may well bewail the lack of *culture*; for his animalizing theories empty the very soul of man of all celestial knowledge, and the great Universe of its infinite significance and its glorious destiny. The Good Lord delivered us from these demon-possessed delusions. Indeed, we hope and pray that He will deliver us from this ape-monkey-sired culture. These evolutionists wish to take us back to their imaginary stone age, or tree age, or cave age when beasts were men and men were beasts. *Satan's dogmas are always horrible*. Hear further from our benighted sage: "Even now for the great mass of men, unable through lack of *culture* to trace out with due clearness those good and bad consequences which conduct brings round through the established order of the Unknowable, it is needful that there should be vividly depicted future torments and future joys."—*Ibid.*, p. 117. Is it not quite proper and very merciful in the *knowable* Heavenly Father to warn men of the fearful consequences of sin and the blessed rewards of righteousness? Our evolutionist needs to be emphatically informed that infidel countries which believe his dogmas are in far more need intellectually, socially and morally of *culture*, than Christian countries where the blessed and solemn Revelations of God are known and observed. All good citizens and true patriots should know and realize that the teachings of evolution are degrading and demoralizing

the rising generation and causing consternation to the social reformer and the Christian philanthropist.

Also, Spencer makes mention of "a most abstract faith in which science and religion unite."—*Ibid.*, p. 118. There is not much true faith in the religions that unite with his fallacious science vagaries. His is a faith from which both truth and science have been abstracted. Also, there is something peculiar about the faith of those who call themselves Christian evolutionists or theistic evolutionists. There is no middle ground between the Lord's account of His own creations and Satan's account of the origin of things. The hypocrite is quite a trimmer, but he can make no compromise between Christ and Belial. The worldly-minded Laodiceans were, doubtless, adroit at compromising, and the Lord said: "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."—Rev. 3:16.

But hear the beautiful self-complacency of our philosopher: "It is hard for him to listen calmly to the futile arguments used in support of irrational doctrines, and to the misrepresentation of antagonistic doctrines." Listen to this: "It is hard for him to bear the manifestation of that pride of ignorance which so far exceeds the pride of science."—*Ibid.*, p. 120. The pride of ignorance is both rare and harmless when compared to the pompous arrogance and hauteur of *the pride of science* which is the proverbial "pride of learning."

He proceeds: "Naturally enough such a one [evolutionist] will be indignant when charged with irreligion because he does not accept the carpenter-theory of creation as the most worthy one."—*Ibid.*, p. 120. Here is a wicked insinuation against our Blessed Lord and Saviour who was a carpenter. Yes, and He was the infinite Carpenter who built the Universe. Here is also a trace of that hateful irreverence which characterizes agnostics and infidels. "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God . . . neither indeed can be."

Now follows a supercilious statement which is tinged with blasphemy: "It is," he says, "difficult to conceal his repugnance to a creed which tacitly ascribes to the Unknowable a love of adulation such as would be despised in a human being."—*Ibid.*, p. 120. Paul tells us that "God was in Christ,

reconciling the world unto himself.”—2 Cor. 5:19. The whole Godhead was humiliated on the cross; for the Good Lord desires to melt the hard heart of man by His infinite love. Did not our Blessed Lord share all hardships with His disciples? Did He not tell them that they were His “friends” and not His “servants”? Did He not even wash the feet of His disciples—including those of Judas? Did He not allow the people to crucify Him? The supreme desire of the Holy Trinity is that we may love the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Then, if we truly love God, we will delight ourselves in His Blessed service, and will willingly, lovingly and spontaneously recognize His Deity in holy worship, adoration and thanksgiving. Only the hateful heart of the unregenerate could use the offensive word—*adulation*—in reference to the Man of Sorrows who loved us and died for us. This antagonistic mental attitude is an unmistakable proof of the *Fall of man*—of his mental depravity.

This Spencer posed as a great philosopher; but we have seen how really *ignorant*, wicked learned men are of the great verities of our Holy Christianity.

HEREDITY

In eager search for the cause of the marvelous differences between the primordial substance, or protoplasm—whatever that may mean—or amœba, and the human being with his wonderful intellectual endowments, some have imagined that heredity had accomplished the amazing developments through long periods of time and by gradual processes. But the rocks must have forgotten these transition links and thoughtlessly neglected their scientific duties; for geologists find no traces of these millions of missing links and, if heredity be the real cause, there must have been numberless millions of transition developments. Here a delicate situation confronts us. We must either charge their goddess, Nature, with a long-continued and wilful neglect of duty; or dame Nature must have been partial in utterly and persistently ignoring the transition specials in both plant and animal life, and in always selecting for embalment only the fortunate normals. But true science teaches that Nature has always been reliable in her processes. During the last 6,000 years, this has been the experience of humanity. Though many animals have been domesticated,

yet transition specimens are not and have never been in evidence. Thus the rock-leaves of Nature give no evidence in favor of Heredity. Also, the experience of countless millions of human beings during long millenniums of time have not found proofs that Heredity was ever an evolution worker.

ENVIRONMENT

In their extremity evolutionists have turned to environment for aid hoping to show that change of food, or air, or habitat might accomplish the creation of new species. But the outlook is not very promising; for environment does not seem to be a more determining factor than Heredity, which has given no known new species. It is true that climate has made the African dark and the Anglo-Saxon white. Also food will bring about changes in appearance and in health, and consequently, to some extent, will affect the disposition. But it has never been known to make any real changes which could be called the creation of a new species. It does not stand to reason that these external things could change the nature, the constitution, of a plant or an animal. This bringing Environment into the discussion is purely speculative. Environment can only produce varieties. It may change color, or size, or specially strengthen or weaken some faculty or member of the body. But these are all minor effects, and do not change the original constitution. They cannot put wool on dogs, or scales on goats, or hair on birds, or wings on swine, or feathers on fish, though ducks swim. The truth is that the boundaries between species are impassable. The fish of the sea, the birds of the air, the beasts of the field always keep their respective places; for this is an orderly-constituted world, which was created in the beginning by the All-powerful, the All-wise, and the All-good Lord God Almighty. Thus, unanswerable proofs, that neither Heredity nor Environment could originate species are given by two verified facts; namely, the testimony of the rocks which keep faithful records of the past, and the testimony of man, who has been on this planet for about 6,000 years; and who, in all his intimate acquaintance with animal life, has never discovered any new species which has been permanent and which had been produced by any process of evolution.

FALSE GODS

The Babylonians worshiped Baal, their sun god; the Phoenicians, Ashtoreth, a female deity; the Philistines, Dagan, their fish god, and Beelzebub, their god of flies; the Greeks and Romans preferred anthropomorphic deities. Zeus and Hera, with lesser divinities, dwelt on Mount Olympus. The Romans gave divine honors to Jupiter and Juno and many others. But the poet Pope makes special reference to an Egyptian deity when he says:

“O worthy thou of Egypt’s wise abodes;
A decent priest, whose monkeys were their gods.”

According to that, deified monkeys were in old Egypt. In dismantling the shrines in the tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amen, Howard Carter discovered that “the roof is richly decorated, the underside bearing the figure of the King, surrounded by five hawks with outspread protective wings, figures of the hawk-headed god Horus, serpents and representation of a monkey-headed god.”—Los Angeles Times, Jan. 21, 1924. There is nothing new “under the Sun”; for today monkeys or apes are really the deities of our agnostics.

In olden times Jehovah was often sorely provoked with the idolatrous tendencies of his people Israel; for they were constantly relapsing into ignorance and barbarism, and would worship the idols of neighboring heathen nations. Now, listen to what the Lord Himself says about this mental prostitution before images of men and beasts:—

1. Ex. 34:15: “Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods.” Here is where the Christian evolutionist is rebuked. He makes a covenant with the evolutionist and calls himself a Christian evolutionist; but the Lord says that he has gone a whoring after their gods, their hairy animals. Be it known that *Christian Evolution and Christian Science are feeble-minded twin sisters.*

2. Lev. 20:5: “Then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech.” Put monkey instead of Molech, and you have just modernized the passage. The Bible is up-to-date—a very modern Book.

3. Judges 2:17: "And yet they would not hearken unto their judges, but they went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them." What a humiliating spectacle evolutionists have presented! They have bowed down mentally to hairy beasts in their painful eagerness to find an animal that would do for a missing link! They have left the search after God for a *search after some chimpanzee, etc.*

4. 1 Chron. 5:25: "And they transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a whoring after the gods of the people of the land, whom God destroyed before them." Did not infidelity and evolution destroy the German Empire by demoralizing the nation? The people left their Great Heavenly Father and Luther's orthodoxy and went seeking for a father among the gorillas. The same fate will happen to us if we commit the same mental prostitution.

5. Jer. 3:9: "And it came to pass through the lightness of her whoredom, that she defiled the land, and committed adultery with stones and with stocks." Some colleges have done the same thing with apes and monkeys.

6. Ezek. 6:9: "I am broken with their whorish heart, which hath departed from me, and with their eyes, which go a whoring after their idols." What is the special charge here? Israel "hath departed from Thee"—from their true God. That is exactly what the evolutionists have done. They have "departed from" God and have relegated Him to oblivion, and are looking to unclean beasts for their ancestry.

7. Ezek. 23:30: "I will do these things unto thee, because thou hast gone a whoring after the heathen, and because thou art polluted with their idols." Have we not gone a whoring after evolutionists with their false and abominable theories which alienate the heart and mind from God?

8. Hosea 1:2: "The land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord." This passage shows that mental whoredom consists "in departing from the Lord." This heinous crime of intellectual infidelity is committed by materialistic professors, who account for things on a beast basis ignoring their Creator.

9. Hosea 9:1: "Rejoice not, O Israel, for joy, as other people: for thou hast gone a whoring from thy God." Departing from God is mental whoredom, and that is exactly

what evolutionists are doing. Remember there is a prostitution of mind as well as a prostitution of body, and both are an abomination to our Heavenly Father.

Sad to relate, that in the last half century certain scientists have tried to rule God out of His Universe, and have deified animals. These agnostics have rejected the beautiful, inspired and well-authenticated Garden of Eden story of our creation in the "image" and after "the likeness" of God, and have sanctimoniously ascribed to some ape-like animal the origin of the human family. Thus they have not only rejected God, but they have really deified animals and put them in the place of the Creator. The appalling wickedness and derangement of the human mind by the Fall is clearly proved by the sad fact that the ungodly actually prefer a beast ancestry to one in the glorious fiat of their Heavenly Father. This abominable evolution is the special humiliation and disgrace of many colleges. Indeed, it is the outstanding mental disgrace of the last half century. The Good Lord have mercy on these intellectual whoredoms in departing from Him, and in frantically working disordered brains to find an animal ancestry for humanity.

These agnostics are following the example of Israel when they made the golden calf and raised the shout: "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."—Ex. 32:4. Here the Lord's ancient people rejected Him and made for themselves an idol and even ascribed to it their deliverance from the land of bondage. That is the very thing which our unbelieving evolutionists are doing today. We will condemn Aaron and the Israelites for making and worshiping a golden calf. But from an æsthetic point of view, is not their taste superior to our *bestly apings*? A golden calf is a nicer god than a grinning, hairy, ill-flavored ape or monkey.

THE SO-CALLED CHRISTIAN EVOLUTIONISTS

Remember that this evolution is nothing more nor less than Satan's explanation of the Cosmos. By this crafty deception the arch-deceiver designs to keep out of our minds all thoughts of our glorious Creator, and what devise could do that more effectively than to deny His Creatorship, and then palm off on us sinful and sin-loving mortals a so-called *scien-*

tific animal ancestry? In this way some feeble-minded Christians are deceived, and are changed into double-minded vacillators that attempt the impossible; they try to be Christians and materialists at the same time. These theistic evolutionists remind one of a two-faced character described by Bunyan—a Mr. Facing-both-ways. Also, among the Latin deities, there was Janus, who had two faces, and could, at the same time, look north and south, or east and west. This is sometimes quite convenient. The Janus divinities have always been quite prominent in politics and religion, and of late quite a number have been found in science, where they are also attempting the unreasonable. They are disgracefully trying to be true Christians and irrational scientists. The Rev. T. T. Martin, D.D., says that “the theistic evolutionist is his particular abomination.” It is a monstrous absurdity to try to put the Lord into partnership with the “Mud Philosophy.” Does the Almighty need the assistance of any ape-like animals to bring into existence beings created in His own “image” and “likeness”? If our Blessed Lord Himself were to address a company of these Christian, theistic evolutionists, He would exclaim: “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.”—Matt. 23:15. For they are turning Christians into hypocrites—they would be both materialists and theists. They resemble luke-warm Christians who would fain serve both God and mammon. But what does the Blessed Lord Himself say on this question? Listen to His emphatic declaration: “No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”—Matt. 6:24. There has been some very foolish talk about a Christian evolution. You cannot blend together the vile “mud philosophy” and the divinely beautiful Garden of Eden story. You may rest assured of this—our Heavenly Father did not depend upon the aid of unclean beasts in the creation of our first parents. Further, He has in His kind fatherly affection told us where He created us and how He created us, and, moreover, He has repeated the account so that we might be well

assured of the glorious fact that we were created in His "image" and after His "likeness." This infernal evolution is both a monstrous absurdity and a vile slander on our humanity.

Generally speaking, people are a little particular—and properly so—about their ancestors. All know that pride of ancestry is well-nigh universal. If recent accounts are reliable, the Mayflower must have had overflow accommodations somewhere. Yet it is an astonishing fact that some people, who appear to be respectable and intelligent Christians, and who, you would naturally suppose, had lofty ideas about their forbears, are really piqued and indignant when you try to convince them that in their genealogical line there were not millions of generations of promiscuously generated simians. There is a quaint old expression which describes the sinner as rolling "sin as a sweet morsel under his tongue." To the average agnostic this repulsive evolution seems to be as honey to his taste. Once I was in the room of a professor, and said something against evolution. At once this theistic evolutionist was greatly perturbed and jumped out of his chair, paced the room, and with excited speech tried to express himself. Why he was so desperately afraid of losing his beast ancestry, is surely a difficult psychological problem. On another occasion, in church, I casually made a similar remark and another professor at once lost his poise and uttered an insulting reply. This thing would really be funny and ridiculous if it were not so sad and scandalous. Who can explain why persons that appear to be civilized and even Christianized, get so angry when reminded that their true genealogy is in the first chapters of the Holy Scriptures, and is not in old heathen materialism that started about 2,500 years ago, and is not in modern agnosticism, which infidels and atheists, who slander the "blessed Virgin Mary" and blaspheme "the Holy Child Jesus," are so crazy to propagate?

Any sensible person would naturally and properly think that a Christian who had ever read the fine Bible account of our Creation by the Lord Himself, in the delightful Garden of Eden, would be filled with joy at the idea that our first parents came into existence by the direct fiat of the Heavenly Father in the most beautiful spot that ever adorned this

earth. On the other hand, one would think that no greater insult could be offered to any decent person than to say that his ancestors sprang from unclean beasts that were promiscuously gendered in some jungle mud-hole among all kinds of reptiles. Such an abnormal and abominable preference of evolutionists must have its origin in an enfeebled or disordered mentality.

Evidently this evolution outrage upon common sense and common decency, is one of the outstanding and unanswerable proofs of the appalling collapse of reason on account of the Fall of man. On no other basis can anyone explain the disgraceful fact that human beings will go a whoring for a beast origin, even after the Blessed Lord in His Holy Word has fully informed us that He fashioned our bodies out of earthy materials and then breathed the breath of life [lives] into Adam,—thus making man after His own “image” and “likeness,” giving him an animal life and a spiritual life.

Indeed, the nobler-minded idolaters of antiquity had higher ideas about their ancestry than our theistic evolutionists. They looked up to the heavenly bodies as being supreme and as being the cause of all things. The Egyptians had a sun god, Re; the Babylonians had their sun god, Baal; the Greeks had anthropomorphic deities—and men are far superior to animals as deities—and the Romans named their gods after the planets—Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, and so on. Surely it was reserved for our groveling evolutionists to descend into the lowest possible depths of mental prostitution and there search with despicable eagerness for some unclean hairy beast, which they might *proudly, scientifically proclaim as their long-sought ancestor*. To these deluded professors, *what a triumph would await science* if they could only find a suitable Mr. and Mrs. Simian! The merciful Lord have compassion on the ignorance and wickedness of the wilfully stupid evolutionists. Jeremiah, that grand old prophet, who so sorely laid to heart the sins of the *people*, and who, with bitter tears mourned over the backslidings of rebellious Israel, uttered the sad and solemn truth about our fallen humanity when he declared: “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”—Jer. 17:9.

The apostles were disgraced by the meanest of all traitors; for where the greatest light is wickedness descends to its lowest levels. Thus the unregenerate mind in enlightened Europe and America—sinning against the glorious effulgence of the Blessed Gospel of our Lord and Saviour—has gone down to the lowest possible depths of mental degradation in searching in apedom and monkeydom for the forbears of our divine humanity. Even the savages of North America had ideas of a supernatural Great Spirit. Likewise the benighted African has celestial questionings, and does not look to the wild beasts for his ancestors. But it was reserved for the unregenerate savants of the most Christianized countries of the world, to perpetrate this degradation and accept Satan's explanation of our origin. This evolution dogma is one of perdition's greatest and most gratifying triumphs. That the evil one had the adroitness to beguile some *ponderously learned professors*, and, with a scientific flourish, lead them from the beauties and splendors of the Garden of Eden to some tadpole mud-hole for the birthplace of their race—that feat gave renown to the archdeceiver and filled his infernal realms with exultation. What a humiliation has come to many proud and rich institutions of learning—they are the derision of perdition.

It is evident that the old evolution theory did not long survive in Greece. This is proved by Paul's statement in Acts 17:28, 29: "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are his offspring. For as much then as we are the offspring of God," etc. This shows that Athens had arisen from soulless materialism to what might be called a theistic idolatry. Further, in addition to their many shrines and temples there was an altar To the Unknown God, Whom "they ignorantly worshipped."—*Ibid.*, verse 23. Indeed, it was said that "at Athens it was easier to find a god than a man." All this goes to show that the classic city was more or less permeated with theistic ideas. How much greater is the intellectual disgrace of our evolutionists in passing by theistic Athens and in going back to the Dark Ages of Greek heathen materialism!

How true are the words of the learned apostle Paul! "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils ;

"Speaking lies in hypocisy ; having their conscience seared with a hot iron."—I Tim. 4:1, 2.

PART II

IS EVOLUTION SCIENTIFIC?

"Light is the Shadow of God."—PLATO.

If, as it is asserted by evolutionists, from some primordial germ or factor known or unknown, there came into being through the long æons of time new species by means of slight depletions, accretions, differentiations, geology would most certainly have multitudinous records of these transformations and developments. But after about 6,000 years of time and after extensive minute researches, not a single well-authenticated specimen of these supposed millions of transmutations of species has been discovered. Yet, according to the evolution theory, the stratified rocks, which are the faithful and unerring leaves of nature's great book, ought literally to teem with myriads of specimens.

Here follow quotations from "Modern Ideas of Evolution," by Sir J. W. Dawson, the noted Canadian geologist and author.

On these points, he says: "Since, however, no case establishing any one of the alleged factors of new species is actually known to have occurred, these doctrines of modification and heredity, as applied to the origin of species, are, as yet, articles of faith and not of scientific certainty, and the whole question in evolution may be said to be in an uncertain and transition state. Here we must admit, in the first place that, though we can study modes of variation of species, no case has actually occurred under the observation of naturalists of the development of a new species."—p. 33.

"We can trace most of the leading types so far back that they seem to constitute parallel rather than diverging lines, and show no certain evidence of diverging."—p. 34.

"An additional difficulty is caused by the fact that in most types we find a great number of kinds in their earlier geological history, and that they dwindle, rather than increase, as they go forward."—p. 35.

Probably the best definition of "missing links" is this: "They are things that never were."

With respect to the origin of man, he says: "We can trace man only a little way back in geological history, not farther than the Pleistocene period, and the earliest men are still men in all essential points, and separated from other animals, recent and fossil, by a gap as wide as that which now exists."—p. 36.

"Geological history" shows "the extreme permanence of many forms of life which have continued to propagate themselves through almost immeasurable ages and great changes of environment, without material variation, and the apparent fixity of these in their final forms is" so "evident that we are relieved from the dread which this nightmare of German brains tends to create." Even man with all his skill and knowledge is not successful in his attempts to produce permanent new species. "This has been well shown by Mr. T. Warren O'Neil, of Philadelphia, who adduces a great number of facts, detailed by Mr. Darwin himself, to show that when the stability of an organism is artificially altered by man in his attempts to establish new breeds, infertility and death of these varieties of breeds result."—p. 51.

Now, if man with all his ability and science cannot produce new species, how much less can the blind material forces of nature accomplish the necessary and mysterious transformation! Even *Darwin's great argument*—"We may well suppose"—*which he has used 800 times*, will hardly convince *real scientists* that nature can perform all these numberless and wonderful transmutations required by the theories of their wildly imaginative brethren.

Sir William truly says of evolutionists: "They thus make these atoms and forces a supreme god, attributing to them the same powers assigned by the theist to the Creator."—p. 59.

"But nature in this sense is only another name for God, whose power and divinity are manifested in every cell of the snow-plant."—p. 80.

Even scientists themselves must admit that there is no scientific basis for evolution. Therefore, "the man who in a popular address or in a text-book, introduces the descent

of species as a proved result of science, to be used in framing classifications and in constructing theories, is leaving the firm ground of nature and taking up a position which exposes him to the suspicion of being a dupe or charlatan."—p. 65.

Dawson also makes the following important statements: "The materials of the physical world are to us manufactured or created products."—p. 74.

"Protoplasm has been called the 'physical basis of life'; but this is merely a form of words to conceal ignorance."—p. 75. Dawson does show clearly that there is no "other origin of species than that ultimate one of the Divine Creative Will."

"It is easy to affirm that the lowest animals and the lowest plants are but protoplasm, which is only another name for the chemical compound albumen."—p. 98.

Concerning the unreasonable claims upon credulity by the evolutionists, Dawson well says: "It is scarcely too much to say that these preposterous demands are usually made, and tactfully assumed to be granted, in most discussions as to the development of living beings in geological times."—p. 102.

DAWSON'S SUMMARY

"The general truths that we know on this great and complicated subject may be shortly summed up as follows:

"1. Life originated long ago. If in the Laurentian, or even in the early Cambrian, we can be sure that it is millions of years since the plant or animal came into existence.

"2. The first forms were of low grades, though of high and perfect types within those grades.

"3. Many types of animals and plants, perhaps most of the leading groups, have continued without any very manifest change or improvement—have been, in short, fixed or stationary types.

"4. Elevation and improvement have taken place by the introduction, apparently in many places simultaneously, of new types, accompanied with, or preceded by, the extinction or degradation of lower forms.

"5. Many new forms appear to be introduced at one time and apparently suddenly; so that such groups as the ferns and club-mosses and mares' tails among plants, and at a later

date the more perfect fruit-bearing trees; and among animals, the corals, the lamp-shells, the crinoids, the amphibians, the reptiles, the higher mammals, enter on the scene abruptly and in large numbers. Thus the impression left on our minds by this grand procession of living beings in geological time is not that of a continuous flow, but that of a cooperation of physical agencies towards a particular preparation of our planet, and then the introduction at once and in great force of suitable inhabitants to the abode prepared for them."—pp. 102-4.

In speaking of the early vegetation, Dawson says that the plants do not "show any sign of an unformed or imperfect state."—p. 109. That "the compound eyes and filmy wings of insects, the teeth, bones and scales of batrachians and fishes" are "all properly finished, and many quite as complete and elegant, as in the animals of the present day."—p. 109. That in the Mesozoic age there were animals of "colossal magnitude," having "variety of function and structure" and "diversity of habitat in sea and land altogether unexampled in their degraded descendants of modern times. Sea-lizards of gigantic size swarmed everywhere in the waters. On land huge quadrupeds like *Atlantosaurus* and *Iguanodon* and *Megalosaurus* greatly exceeded the elephants of later times."—p. 110.

Sir William makes the further important statements:

"1. The chain of life in geological time presents a wonderful testimony to the reality of a beginning, etc.

"2. The geological record informs us that the general laws of nature have continued unchanged from the earliest periods to which it relates until the present day. This is the true 'uniformitarianism of geology,' which holds to the dominion of existing causes from the first, etc.

"3. Throughout the geological history there is progress toward greater complexity and higher grade along with degradation and extinction, etc.

"4. There is thus a continued plan and order in the history of life, which cannot be fortuitous, and which is coincident with the gradual perfection of the physical condition of the earth itself. The chance interaction of organisms and their environment, even if we assume the organisms

and environment as given to us, could never produce an orderly continuous progress of the utmost complexity in its detail, and extending through an enormous lapse of time, etc.

"5. The progress of life in geological time has not been uniform and uninterrupted.

"6. There is no direct evidence that in the course of geological time one species has been gradually or suddenly changed into another." "On the other hand, we constantly find species replaced by others, entirely new, and this without any transition." "The worthlessness of such derivation is well shown in a case which has often been paraded as an illustration of evolution—the supposed genealogy of the horse," etc.—pp. 112-120.

From the foregoing, it is quite evident that evolution has not even the status of a theory, or an hypothesis; for it is absolutely without scientific data. These pseudo-scientists abound in such phrases as "it cannot be doubted," "we may therefore assume," "we may readily suppose," "this afterwards assumes or becomes," "we may confidently assert," "this developed directly." The unprincipled Haeckel likewise had his famous *supposition argument*—"We must suppose"—and he supposed that millions of missing links must have existed sometime. But that grand Dame Nature, though she has an infallible memory, has no records of *these supposed* missing millions of transition specimens.

"Heredity and adaptation are constantly paraded as if they were two potent divinities employed in constantly changing and improving the face of nature."—p. 140.

Dugald Stewart has well said:

"1. Every effect implies a cause.

"2. Every combination of means to an end implies intelligence."—Dawson, p. 189.

In this relation, there is no such thing as *chance* or *necessity*.

Great is the complexity of some structures. Dawson says: "In nothing, perhaps, is this better seen than in that much abused 'protoplasm' which has been made to do duty for God in the origination of life, but which is itself a most laboriously manufactured material. Albumen or white of egg—which is otherwise named protoplasm—is a very com-

plicated substance, chemically, and in its molecular arrangements, and when endowed with life, it presents properties altogether inscrutable." He further says: "It has been calculated that a speck scarcely visible under the most powerful microscope may contain two million four hundred thousand molecules of protoplasm." Further, he says: "Each of these molecules really contains eight hundred and eighty-two atoms, namely four hundred of carbon, three hundred and ten of hydrogen, one hundred and twenty of oxygen, fifty of nitrogen, and two of sulphur and phosphorus."

If God did not create all things, then "Nature must be a goddess gifted with superhuman powers of calculation and marvellous deftness in arranging invisible atoms."—pp. 200-3.

"I have recently studied the microscopic structures of a large collection from the Niagara limestone, consisting of many species, each of which presents arrangements of spicules as beautiful and complex as those of the modern kinds."—p. 206.

According to Romanes, "Nature selects the best individuals out of each generation to live." But Dawson replies: "Here nature must be an intelligent agent, or the statement is simply nonsensical."—p. 217.

Concerning the unity of the race, Sir William says: "No zoological systematist now doubts that all the races of men are specifically identical."—p. 222.

"It is a lamentable fact that the greater part of men of science who are evolutionists openly discard all religious belief, and teach this unbelief to the multitude."—p. 240. This scienceless evolution was born in ancient times among heathen materialists and through the centuries it has been the cherished dogma of blind unbelief and blatant infidelity, and today the ungodly and the wicked glory in their imaginary shame as the progeny of ill-gendered reptiles and mammals.

Paul arraigns these evolutionists in a most explicit manner: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And

changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, . . . Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen."—Rom. 1:21-25.

How true are the Scriptures! These wicked people make God's account of man's creation a lie, and instead of worshipping God as their Creator, they honor some ape-like or monkey-like hairy animal as their great ancestor—really as their creator, and like the old Egyptians they have a monkey god.

SCHOLARS ARE RENOUNCING EVOLUTION

Dr. N. S. Shaler, professor of Harvard University, eminent as a scientist, thus declares himself:

"It begins to be evident to naturalists that the Darwinian hypothesis is still essentially unverified. Notwithstanding the evidence derived from the study of animals and plants under domestication, it is not yet proved that a single species of the two or three millions now inhabiting the earth had been established solely or mainly by the operation of natural selection."—Col. of Evo., p. 48. Col. Evo. stands for "Collapse of Evolution," by Prof. L. T. Townsend.

Professor C. C. Everett, also of Harvard, in speaking of evolution, says: "If in the past those ranks of beings ever rose and moved in procession along the upward slope . . . it was before the eyes of man were opened to them. No searching of his awakened powers can detect, even among the remains of an unknown antiquity, any glimpse of the great movement while in progress of accomplishment. All, as he looks upon it, is as fixed as the sphinx that slumbers on the Egyptian sands. All this story of transformation and activity is a dream."—Col. of Evo., pp. 48 and 49.

Dr. Joseph Henry, late secretary of the Smithsonian Institute and Professor Arnold Henry Guyot, of Princeton University . . . emphatically discredited the theory of evolution, and are to be classed with Agassiz, Shaler, Dwight and Everett."

Dr. William Hanna Thomson, former president of the New York Academy of Medicine, and one of the most noted medical men in the country, emphatically rejects the theories of Darwin, Huxley and Tyndale on the simple ground that "they do not explain anything."—Col. of Evo., p. 50.

"The best informed, or at least the fairest-minded, scientists have reached the conclusion that 'degeneration has marked the history of every living form.' . . . Fossil radiates and mollusks were larger and in some cases more finely marked than any that appear in our modern seas." . . . "The size of some of the prehistoric reptiles seems almost incredible when compared with their degenerate and pigmy descendants." . . . "And perhaps nothing has better support than the conservative announcement of the late Professor Cope, a pronounced evolutionist until just before his death, that 'Retrogradation in nature is as well established as evolution.'"

Sir William Ramsay has made recently a bold and telling attack upon the current very fashionable and sentimental theory that the race is steadily advancing. He affirms, to quote his exact words, that "degeneration, and not progress, has been the law of the world."—The B. C., Jan., 1917. (B. C. will stand for Bible Champion.)

Dr. Leavitt, Ex-President of Lehigh University, recently had this to say: "All the facts of the past cycles of the earth are against Darwinism. Protoplasm evolving a universe is a superstition more pitiable than paganism which worshiped the image of Diana as the mother of creation."—Col. of Evo., p. 50.

Dr. Etheridge, of the British Museum, one of England's most famous experts in fossilology, passed the following criticism upon evolution:

"In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of transmutation of species. Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by fact. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views."—Ibid., p. 51.

The Bible Champion of April, 1921, speaks of "the gullibility of learned professional men." "They remind one of a saying of Martineau: 'The history of knowledge abounds

with instances of men who, with the highest merit in particular walks of science, have combined a curious incompetence when attempting a survey of the whole field.'” Of this incompetence, the Christian Scientists and the Theistic Evolutionists are brilliant examples. How the latter can squeeze a Christian in between God and Darwin is surely a work which may be called *black art*. You verily cannot mix Genesis and materialism; for there is no fellowship between Christ and Belial.

MOLECULES

“According to Avogadro’s hypothesis, one cubic centimeter of any gas contains, under standard conditions, the same number of molecules, which number is estimated at 25-36 million million millions.”—Webster’s Dict.

The following diameters have been calculated by the kinetic theory of gases—mean values—Hydrogen gas= 2.03×10^{-8} which

Equals	$\frac{1}{2.03 \times 10^8}$	Air gas	$= \frac{1}{2.83 \times 10^8}$
Carbon monoxide gas	$= \frac{1}{2.85 \times 10^8}$	Oxygen gas	$= \frac{1}{2.70 \times 10^8}$
Nitrogen	$= \frac{1}{2.92 \times 10^8}$	Oxygen dioxide	$= \frac{1}{3.33 \times 10^8}$
		—En. Br., p. 656.	
		1	

Examine the last one, $3.33 \times 10^{-8} = \frac{1}{333,000,000}$. That is,

the average diameter of these molecules is less than one three-hundred-millionth of an inch. Further, consider that these molecules are composed of atoms and that in these atoms there are protons and electrons. How infinitely minute must the final units be!

“Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign will.”
—Cowper.

Even with his microscope magnifying thousands of diameters, the scientist is lost amid the inconceivable minuteness and accuracy of molecular structures. And some one must give account for the presence of the molecule on this planet. According to Darwin's "preference, all plants and animals have descended from some one prototype."—Descent of Man, p. 665. Thus even Darwin was compelled to believe that the prototype must have been *created by some Power*. But he made this monstrous assumption that from this single prototype, which was *small indeed*, there must have come all plants, all animals and all human beings. At this stage of the discussion, deluded Darwin will sorely need the aid of numberless millions of his *stock argument*: "We may well suppose."

CHEMISTRY

The following quotations are from "Outlines of Science," edited by Professor Thomson, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, Vol. III, 1922.

"The atoms of all matter consist of positive and negative electricity; the simplest atom, that of hydrogen, is a unit of negative electricity, called an electron, revolving around a nucleus of positive electricity, called a proton."—p. 715.

A particle or molecule of water is a very simple combination. It consists of two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen; but "a molecule of proteid called albumen is built up by 72 atoms of carbon, 112 atoms of hydrogen, 18 atoms of nitrogen, all brought into association with one atom of sulphur." The white of an egg is one of the mysteries of nature.

"Alcohol is an organic compound consisting of a hydrocarbon radical in connection with one or more hydroxyl groups (example, C_2H_5OH)."—General Chemistry, Deming, 1923, p. 311. "Methyl alcohol (methanol) or wood alcohol, CH_3OH , is obtained by the destructive distillation of wood. It is intensely poisonous, a small quantity being sufficient to cause death or permanent blindness. It is used in the manufacture of formaldehyde, as a solvent in the preparation of varnishes, and for denaturing alcohol." There are other alcohols, such as "*propyl alcohol*, C_3H_7OH ; *butyl alcohol*, C_4H_9OH ; *amyl alcohol*, $C_5H_{11}OH$. These *higher alcohols*

are oily liquids, collectively known as fusel oils.”—Ibid., p. 312.

“Cane sugar is $C_{12}H_{22}O_{11}$ —i.e., $C_{12} (H_2O)_{11}$.” “But the most important are those of the formulas $(C_6H_{12}O_6)$ (monoses) and $C_{12}H_{22}O_{11}$ (bioses).”—Ibid., p. 321.

Starch $(C_6H_{10}O_5)_x$ is formed in the leaves of all green plants.—Ibid., p. 325.

Cellulose has a similar chemical formula. It is “a carbohydrate . . . of the same percentage composition as starch.” It “constitutes the chief part of the solid framework of plants, of ordinary wood, linen, paper,” etc.—Ibid., p. 325.

When we think of the minuteness and the diversity of the operations of nature with CHO—Carbon, Hydrogen and Oxygen—we are truly filled with wonder. In alcohol, man drinks CHO—often to saddest sorrows—but in sugar we eat them and they compose one of the greatest foods, while with CHO as linen we are arrayed in fine raiment, and of CHO as paper we make ten thousand uses. Indeed, the world has largely been built of CHO—wood. But this profound question arises: How did these infinitesimal particles come into being so variously, wonderfully and mysteriously organized? Did they make and endow themselves with their infinitely subtle and complicated laws of correlation? Well, in a word, this insane vagary that atoms themselves arranged the numberless, infinitely minute and accurate adjustments and combinations given above—this insane vagary baffles description and violates every law of reason.

CRYSTALLOGRAPHY

Butler in his Geometrical Crystallography enumerates the following systems, namely: Isometric, Hexagonal, Tetragonal, Orthorombic, Monoclinic and Triclinic. Each of these has from one to seven subdivisions. Also, it is known that the atoms and molecules of a substance composing a crystal are arranged—each in its own peculiar pattern. In their work on X-rays and Crystal Structure the Braggs—father and son—say: “When atoms are, as it were, given an opportunity to arrange themselves, they adopt a geometrical disposition of perfect regularity. Each chemical compound

has its own crystalline form by which in most cases it may be identified."—p. 50. Also, the angles of the faces, as well as the arrangement of the molecules, are peculiar and regular. This gives beauty and variety to the mineral kingdom.

Moreover, molecules are infinitesimal quantities. Here is a case given by the Braggs: "This cell contains four molecules of CaCO_3 (calcite or Iceland Spar), each weighing 1.64×10^{-24} grams."—p. 115. That equals $\frac{1}{1.64 \times 10^{24}}$ and that equals 1,640-sextillionth of a gram. Thus, this molecule of CaCO_3 is an inconceivably small part of a gram, and a gram equals 1-25 oz. avoirdupois.

Speaking of X-rays Crystal Structure, the Braggs say: "On various grounds it has been known for some time that the length of the X-ray wave, if there be such a thing, should be about 10^{-8} cm. or 10^{-9} cm., i.e., about ten thousand times smaller than the waves of sodium light."—p. 5.

Deming, in his General Chemistry, speaks about the atoms in a crystal. "When the arrangement of the atoms in a crystal has been determined by observations with X-rays . . . a simple calculation, based on the density of the material, enables us to calculate the distance of each atom from its neighbors. This varies somewhat from crystal to crystal, but is around 2.8×10^{-8} cm.,—the figure for common salt. Otherwise expressed, there are about 35,000,000 of sodium and chlorine in a distance of 1 cm. (4-10 of an inch) measured along an edge of a crystal of common salt; and in the surface layer of a cubical crystal 1 cm. on an edge . . . we would have the square of 35,000,000—more than as many atoms, in fact, as there would be bricks, of 32 sq. in. each, in a brick pavement covering the whole continent of North America."—p. 82.

In the Journal of the American Chemical Society for January, 1924, there is an article entitled "A Statement of the Third Law of Thermodynamics," by E. D. Eastman. In discussing certain crystals, he says in notes 6 and 7 on page 42: "It is obvious but perhaps should be explicitly emphasized that this equation and the results to which its

subsequent application lead, are purely suggestive in character and without exact significance. Their inclusion here is justified only because our knowledge in this field is at present so imperfect that every hint is valuable."

Also, in the Scientific American for January, 1923, there is an article on "Thermal Opalescence in crystals. Among scientists there seems to be some difference of opinion as to the cause of blue opalescence in ice, icebergs and glaciers; for the beautiful secrets of the Supreme Being in nature often elude the scientists. Some have thought "that the color is simply an absorption effect." But the author of the article does not accept that explanation. Many of the secrets of nature are yet *far beyond human ken*.

From these frank statements of the learned, it appears that even the wise ones have not yet mastered some of the subtle mysteries of crystallization. They just cannot even follow the infinite Creator into the secret recesses of His electrified creations. The great schools of both Europe and America have been victimized and disgraced by an insane inundation of senseless, baseless evolution dogmatism. Let us turn from this disgusting animalizing theory, and rejoice to exclaim with the apostle Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"—Rom. 11:33. In a grain of sand, "how unsearchable are His judgments," and in the Universe "*His ways are past finding out!*"

"A gram (1-25 oz. Avoirdupois) of ordinary quartz sand contains about 10^{22} molecules." That is they equal in number 10 sextillions, which expressed in numerals is 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. "Now, a very sensitive balance will just detect a difference in weight of the twenty-thousandth part of a gram. Such a mere speck of quartz would actually contain 5×10^{17} molecules, and if every person in the United States were set to counting them at the rate of one hundred a minute, the count would take about one hundred years."—Deming, p. 81. But $5 \times 10^{17} = 500,000,000,000,000,000$. What mysteries of creation are wrapped up in a grain of sand!

RADIUM

"The properties of Radium are most unusual. All radium salts, and the metal itself, are radioactive." By this we mean that "*they continuously emit energy*, in the form of heat, light, and invisible radiations. These radiations are able to penetrate sheets of paper, and some of them may even pass through a thick block of lead."—p. 538. "The intensity of the radioactivity continues for many years without perceptible diminution." Now, "it turns out that *one of the products of the radioactive disintegration of radium is always helium*." But "radium is always found in nature in association with uranium."—p. 539. "Recently the price of radium has been materially reduced by the opening of new deposits of the ore in the Congo. It is now about \$75,000 for 1 gram of the pure element. This means that a quantity of pure radium bromide equal to the weight of a postage stamp, may be purchased for about \$2,000.

There are several kinds of rays. Those called the Alpha-rays are known to consist of doubly positively charged helium atoms (He), sometimes called alpha particles. These are hurled off from the radioactive material with enormous velocities (around ten thousand miles a second). Also there are other kinds of rays known to be streams of electrons, sometimes called beta-particles, moving in straight lines, with velocities of from about 16,000 to 180,000 miles per second.

Of course, "a radioactive substance . . . gradually disappears. . . ." "The *periods* of the different radioactive elements, that is, the time in which half of any given sample will disappear—varies enormously. In the case of one of the isotopes of uranium (uranium!) it is about 13,000,000,000 years, others have periods of a few years, a few days, or a few seconds. The period of C¹ is less than a billionth of a second."—p. 550. The more we study the works of God, the more fully are we convinced of the inexpressible absurdity of evolution.

THE SINGING CRYSTAL

The following quite full quotations are taken from "Chats on Science," by Edwin E. Slosson, 1924.

"As the lecturer walked down the aisle the crystal was dangling from his hand by a pair of insulated wires as though it were a portable lamp bulb. But instead of light, it was sending out sound. It was an orchestra in itself, playing Sousa's march.

"The crystal was about two inches tall and thick. At the top and bottom were metal plates clamped together by screws so as to put the crystal under pressure. One wire was fastened to these end pieces. The other was tied round the middle of the crystal. These wires ran to the other end of the room where they were fastened to a similar crystal in the same way. This crystal had a needle attached that followed the furrow of a phonograph record. This crystal served as the transmitter, and the other one as the receiver of the sound. A vacuum-tube amplifier magnified the music so that the whole audience could hear.

"The first crystal took up the vibrations of the phonograph and converted them into electric waves that followed out along the wire. The crystal at the other end took up the electric waves and converted them into sound waves. One crystal sang to the other.

"I took the singing crystal in my hand. It was throbbing like a canary bird's throat. When it was set upon the table it writhed and wriggled across the board.

"A phonograph is unnecessary as a source of sound. Rub your finger ever so gently on one crystal, and its distant partner growls. Pinch one crystal and the other shrieks in pain. If you write on the piece of paper on which the crystal is laid, the scratching of your pen sounds like the rattling of a typewriter.

"Two such crystals make a complete telephone. You talk at one and your friend holds his to his ear. That is all there is to it. No battery, you see. The crystal provides its own electricity, making it upon the force of your voice. One little crystal is enough to run two hundred telephones.

"The lecturer provided each of us with a telephone receiver, all connected by long wires. He then took the crystal with him out-of-doors, and from there he talked and sang to us. His voice sounded just as clear as if he had been in the room.

"Presumably these sensitive crystals were found very useful in picking up German conversation during the war. Crystals of any desired weight up to two pounds weight can be grown. They can be kept in working order for several years." They improve with age and practice.

"The best material for crystals is Rochelle salt, a tartrate of sodium and potassium . . . The crystals that form at the bottom of a saturated solution of this salt are of two sorts, the same shape but differently set, like the left and right hand gloves.

"Such lop-sided crystals . . . have a peculiar effect upon a ray of light passing through them. The direction of vibration of the light waves is twisted around toward the right by one kind of crystal, toward the left by the other kind by the same amount. Now, the substances that affect light in this way show this peculiar electrical effect also.

"If the current fluctuates, the crystal will vibrate. . . . This piezo-electricity was used during the war to measure the pressure inside cannon. The enormous pressure produced by modern power reaches its highest point for only a fifty-thousandth of a second."

It is thought that this discovery concerning these peculiar crystals may be utilized to aid the deaf.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY

A writer in "Outlines of Science," 1922, says: "As a matter of . . . fact the speed of light . . . is 186,000 miles per second."—p. 824. Again, he states: "Now an electromagnetic wave travels about 1,000 million feet in a second, so that the time difference between the front and back of a wave 2,000 feet long is only $\frac{1}{500,000}$ of a second." "The electrons to produce these waves, must oscillate 500,000 times per second."—p. 836. It is thought that "an electron is a particle having about one-thousandth the mass of a hydrogen atom."

The Braggs say, "The method we have just referred to also permits us to calculate the number of molecules in a cubic centimeter of air. This turns out to be around 27×10^{18} ; namely 27 followed by eighteen zeros, which is 27,000,000,000,000,000,000. Otherwise expressed, there are

as many molecules in a cubic centimeter of gas as grains of sand, each one-fiftieth of an inch in diameter, in a cubic mile of sand. But since the molecules of air are in motion, a better illustration of the number in this mere thimbleful of air would be a snow-storm. A fall of 27×10^{18} of snowflakes would cover the whole United States, three millions of square miles, to a depth of about an inch."—p. 82.

The wonders of the Radio are literally filling the world with unbounded amazement and admiration for the skill of man and the marvelously beneficent goodness of the Almighty. At last man has so far discovered the secrets hidden in God's air that the human voice can be transmitted and heard at places thousands of miles distant. This is one of the most outstanding achievements of all the centuries. Now a whole nation can listen to the chimes of a cathedral and the music of an opera, to orations from a forum and sermons from a pulpit, to the great debates in Congress, in Parliament, in legislative halls, in great conventions, in Church Conferences and in General Assemblies. Also, the whole program at a Presidential Inauguration can be heard by the Nation. Indeed, a powerful radio placed in the heart of Europe, could be heard by the nations of that Continent. It must be granted that Marconi, the celebrated Italian scientist, has put the world under lasting obligations by giving to this age one of the most important inventions that ever blessed the human race.

But let us reverently ask: Whence came this "invisible, colorless and tasteless mixture of gases which surround the earth, and which we call the atmosphere? It is composed principally of nitrogen, oxygen and argon." Who created this invisible covering for our planet? Who mingled the gases of the air in their proper proportions? Who counted their molecules and atoms and meted out to each its proper proportion of protons and electrons? Who properly electrified the atmosphere and made it serviceable to man in so many and in such various spheres?

METEOROLOGY

Who regulates the temperature of our planet? The Almighty could let loose the internal fires and make this earth

a desolation of ashes and cinders. Who so accurately balances the weight of the atmosphere and that of the aqueous vapors as to give snow on the mountains and rain in the valleys? Has not our Heavenly Father so arranged the forces of nature as to distribute properly shower and sunshine from ocean shore to mountain range? What mysteries are wrapped up in water— H_2O ? Hydrogen— H —as a gas is highly inflammable; but when combined with oxygen— O —it is our protection against fire.

All substances contract with cold, except water. But at 39° Fahr. it is at its greatest density. Then below that it expands, and at 32° it freezes—becomes a solid. If it followed the general law of contraction, in winter as the water froze it would gradually sink to the bottom of rivers and lakes, and they would become solid bodies of ice. Consequently, in spring the melting mountain snows and the rains, having no river channels, would just flood and devastate the landscape. Besides that, the great stores of ice in frozen rivers and lakes would retard the coming of spring. Now, who is so insane as to imagine that H and O foresaw all this, and arranged a plan to make themselves exceptions to the general laws of that Grand Dame, Nature? Whoever she may be, this whole evolution craze affords monumental evidences of mental imbecility or depravity. Truly, the wicked are not rational in the moral and spiritual realms. Listen to that old idolatrous cry of learned heathen—"Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Well, it is far more refined and aesthetic than that loathsome modern cry of our agnostics: "Great is Darwin of the monkeys."

When we consider the stupendous framework of the Universe with its glories by day and the brilliancies of its constellations by night, we are lost in "wonder, love and praise"; but when we attempt to examine the infinitesimal structures of molecules and atoms, and the electrical velocities of electrons and protons with their positive and negative poles, we are dumb with utter amazement, and from the depths of our souls we cry out: There is a God who created the heavens and the earth, and whose creative fiat stands at the head of every species of plant and animal, and whose Holy Word informs us that God created man in His own "image" and "likeness"

in "the Garden of Eden." It is this Supreme Being that regulates the movements of the Milky Way, that sits upon the circle of the heavens and rolls His thunders along, and yet metes out with infinitely minute accuracy to each proton and electron its proper portion of magnetic force. On the one hand the astronomer with his great telescope cannot find the boundaries of this Universe, while on the other the chemist and mineralogist, the zoologist and botanist with all their microscopes cannot discover the hidden secrets of the molecule and atom. Verily, our God is the Almighty Creator who "builds like a giant and finishes like a jeweler."

BOTANY

If atoms and molecules, if gases and crystals presented insolvable problems, how much more difficult of explanation are the mysteries that enfold plants and animals! The earth has been wonderfully enriched and beautified by its multitudinous flora. Every blade of grass and leaf of the forest, every flower of the garden and blossom of the orchard and every balmy breeze laden with the fragrance of fruits—all proclaim the wealth and bounty of the vegetable kingdom. It was neither fate nor chance that bestowed upon mankind this beautiful home with all its treasures of sea and land, of field and forest. And only insanity would proclaim that these gifts of nature were self-created.

How appropriate are Tennyson's lines!

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies:—
Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

In a grain of sand are hidden mysteries which are utterly beyond the reach of scientists. But as we ascend from the inorganic realm to the organic as seen in the flora and fauna, we are lost in the mysteries of life and growth and propagation. These miserable materialists are absolutely dumb in the presence of life. In their lamentable ignorance they cannot explain the nature or account for the presence of a proton or an electron, of an atom or a molecule. They are dumbfounded in the presence of life in its simplest forms.

Their sciences are mere insanities; their philosophies are pitiful beggings of the question; their facts are simply nonentities; and their reasonings are mere illusions. They deal in imaginary generalizations, in factless inductions and, of course, their conclusions are fallacious.

However, did some kind neighbor atoms and electrons, that had already bestowed upon themselves a suitable body and brain—did some such self-made sympathetic neighbors offer their experience and skill to aid for a similar elevation in the scale of being? When will agnostics cease their wicked deification of matter and their denial of God as the Creator of all things in air, on land and in the sea, and believe in the Great First Cause as He has revealed Himself in His Holy Word?

BIOLOGY

The following quotations are from "Outlines of Science," edited by Professor Thomson, of Scotland, Vol. III, 1922.

"Cells are for the most part quite microscopic in size. Human red blood corpuscles, for instance, are so tiny that in the volume of blood equal to a cube one millimeter each way (about 1-15,000 of a cubic inch) some 5,000,000 of them are floating." That is, in a cubic inch there would be $15,000 \times 5,000,000 = 75,000,000,000$ red blood corpuscles. Truly man "is fearfully and wonderfully made."—Ps. 139:14. "As the amount of blood in an average man amounts to about 7 pounds by weight, this figure must be multiplied about three million times to give the total number of corpuscles in the body. A similar figure will be found for other sorts of cells."—pp. 683-4. What countless millions of molecules there must be in the human body!

Again, "at the autumnal climax of productivity in lakes, there may be to the square yard 7,000 millions of a well-known Diatom, *melosira varians*, so that the water is like a living soup. . . . Hardly any larger than some Infusorians are some of the Rotifers, sometimes with about 1,000 cells; a minnow has its millions, and a bird its millions of millions."—p. 707. Evidently the absolute accuracy and minuteness of the Creator's works furnish abounding testimony against all this old heathen materialism about the origin of life.

There was some excuse for Anaximander and his fish story; for he had no microscope or scientific apparatus; but our agnostics must be both woefully and wilfully stupid.

One writer informs us that "some biologists hold the view that there is an 'ultimate molecule of life,' or 'supreme life stuff,' named plastogen." These evolutionists must acknowledge that the facts of nature are transcendent; that there is "complexity and immensity of result" in "the whole creation of plant and animal life," and "that their appearance constitutes in effect, a new departure, a sudden, and to us, unaccountable acquirement." Indeed, they grant "that the riddle of life is still unread," and that scientists "cannot explain the nature of things."—pp. 717-8.

Our bewildered agnostics much resemble the old idolators who felt in their very souls that neither Poseidon in his waves nor Zeus on his Mount Olympus could account for the mysteries of life, and, therefore, they built an altar "*To the Unknown God*." In like manner our bewildered evolutionists must imagine that there is a Deity Power somewhere to account for the wonders wrapped up in molecules and atoms, especially in plants and animals and most especially in man.

All ought to remember that "we can neither create nor destroy the smallest particle." Let scientists cease their vain and feeble speculations and lift their thoughts in reverence and worship to the Almighty Creator who alone can create and annihilate. "For in six eras the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is."—Ex. 20:11. The original word Yom means not only day, but any period of time, such as era, æon, etc.

INVERTEBRATE ZOOLOGY, BY VAN CLEAVE

Naturally this author has trouble with classification; for according to evolution, there should be nothing but confusion throughout the whole world. Just a boundless chaos should reign in matter, in plants, in animals, in mankind, and throughout the universe. Since it is hardly sane to imagine that laws can make either themselves or anything else, we should expect to find that this world was nothing but a blun-

dering jumble—with wild Chaos as King over a raging Pandemonium.

“Ruin seize thee, ruthless king,
Confusion on thy banners wait.
With ruin upon ruin, rout on rout,
Confusion worse confounded.”—*Milton*.

But according to the true theistic contention, law and order are supreme everywhere. We find in the organic realms invariable and inviolable boundaries between the different elements and their chemical compounds, so in plants and animals there is the same absolute conformity to fundamental principles. Therefore, while the agnostic cannot define species, because in his mind nature is only a jumble, the Christian theist has a simple and true statement. To him *species consists in unity of ancestry*. All plants and animals from the same original created stock are of the same species.

These facts do not give much credence to the lawless and senseless jumbings of mindless evolution. This recent evolution rage, which has cursed colleges and schools, is the outstanding proof of the insanity of sin. Oh! that men would seek the truth in both nature and Revelation. Truth possesses both simplicity and beauty; but error and heresy have devious ways, hideous forms. They deal in fiction and fallacy, and often win by subtle subterfuges. But the simple “truth is mighty and will prevail.” Already German *Irrationalism* and Darwin’s unreasonable evolution are sinking into the fathomless abyss of eternal nothingness.

The author says: “It is only within the past century, however, that the spontaneous generation of the lower organisms was finally discredited and disproved. That all life comes only from living things was only then established as an axiom.” The above confession was wrested from agnostics by the irresistible logic of facts. But even after this necessary acknowledgment, the author immediately relapses into the usual mental atrophy which afflicts agnostics, and asserts: “Power of reproducing its like is an inherent property of protoplasm which sharply differentiates it from all lifeless matter.”—p. 7. Here is the foundation fallacy of all this miserable materialism. These so-called scientists can tell

us neither whence life came, nor what it is. They just insanely go on inventing all kinds of protoplasms. Whenever a new specimen must be accounted for a new protoplasm is imagined *by the scientists*. For instance, there are the following: estoplasm, endoplasm, cytoplasm, sporoplasm, dento-plasm and sarcoplasm. These imaginary causes are really the deities of agnostics. Thus, when forced to give up an old absurdity they just invent a new one.

However, the author is right where he says: "There are numerous evidences that plant life existed on the earth before animals came into being."—p. 54. But now comes another assumption: "Movement is an inherent property of all protoplasm."—p. 62. Again he here relapses into absurdity. While he denies the spontaneous generation of life, he supplies its place by inventing "living protoplasm."—p. 66. But where does he get it? These infidels are always begging the question, and often argue in a circle. Well, after having invented his "living protoplasm," he informs us that it is inclined to be liquid. Probably he is just imitating the old heathen, Thales, who taught that "water is the first principle, the universal substratum of which the other bodies are merely modifications." Again, our author blunders: "The energy manifested by a living organism results largely from the union of oxygen with protoplasm and its contained food substances."—p. 69. But where does he get his living organism? *Another instance of begging the question.*

At the very beginning of his work the author feels the need of a "Basis of Classification," and gives the reader this information: "The entire system of classification of animals is based upon interpretation and judgment. There are no absolute units of measure which determine how many species or how many classes any phylum is to include. Every attempt at classification in some measure aims to express varying degrees of relationship between different organisms, and every decision regarding relationships is based on fixed premises."—p. 2. But where does he get his "fixed premises"? He further states that classification "is based upon interpretation and judgment"; that is, it depends upon the "interpretation and judgment" *of each author*. Of course, in a jumbled-up universe where plants and animals and

human beings are all mixed together in heterogeneous confusion, classification is an impossibility. On the other hand, to those that accept the scientific account of the origin of all species and orders in the fiat of the Almighty, the classification does not depend on the whims of men, but is self-evident and easily discerned; for it consists simply *in unity of ancestry*. Let these bewildered agnostics know that absolute precision and order characterize all the works of the Creator.

Now this author most learnedly, patiently and minutely discusses invertebrates. He begins with the Phylum Protozo and finishes in Chapter XV with the Phylum Arthropoda. Then he discusses Insects. How any intelligent person can carefully study even these lower grades of animal life, and witness the minuteness and accuracy of structure shown in the Metazoa and Phylum Porifera, in the Phylum Mollusca and Insecta, and not discern that every species keeps within its own boundaries and propagates only and always after its own kind, its own species—how can he witness the incontrovertible fact that the specimens are perfect in their own order (where are the monstrosities, the freaks of nature and the needful millions of missing links?)—how can he witness these facts in millions of cases of perfectly ordered and perfectly segregated specimens, and yet believe in the scienceless and senseless hodgepodge, agglomeration theory? This jumble and scramble theory must be called the work of chance and fate; but *there are no such things as chance and fate*. This is a well-ordered Universe, ruled by a Beneficent Moral Governor who is the Supreme, Absolute and Eternal Personality of infinite power, wisdom and goodness.

The author in his last chapter, which is on Phylogeny, rejects the fine classification of plants and animals made by Linnaeus and favours "The Origin of Species" by Darwin, and says: "At the present time there is much ground for lack of agreement concerning how species have come into existence but among scientists there is no longer any doubt but that species, genera and even phyla have moved in a continuous procession since the inception of life on this planet." After making this bald assertion, Professor Van Cleave follows the usual custom of agnostics and blandly

says: "It is not the purpose of this chapter to prove the ideas of continuity, development, and differentiation of living organisms, for this is now accepted by those who take the trouble to examine the evidences as little less than axiomatic. Nor yet is it the intention to speculate upon the methods or processes whereby these changes in the fauna and the creation of different types came about. Even among the best informed scientists there is yet lack of unanimity of opinion upon these subjects."—p. 231. After making some vague statements, he acknowledges: "It is only through common ancestry that these lines of kinship are traced."—p. 232. These bewildered evolutionists will finally be compelled to cease their quibbling and accept the theistic contention that *species consist in unity of ancestry*. Again, he wanders when he asserts: "Present-day organisms are but points in the lines of evolutionary progress. The source and the termination of any such are but rarely discovered." This is not true. Take the tame animals, the wild animals, the birds, the fish—they can be traced up to the oldest fossil remains and they are just the same as their present day posterity, but if there is any change the ancient are the superior.

In his Conclusion the professor acknowledges: "Each of the numerous theories, of which the foregoing are characteristic examples, is based upon a group of facts derived from studies in comparative anatomy and embryology. Yet no one theory depicts a satisfying genealogy of the vertebrate group."—p. 238. Finally, he candidly acknowledges: "Similarity in structure and development and even homologies between the numbers of two animal groups do not prove that one has originated from the other." In a closing word he confesses: "The key to the ancestry of the vertebrates lies hidden, possibly lost," and "A search for this ancestral form among the highly differentiated animal forms of today is little short of hopeless."—p. 239. These belaboring scientists resemble the tired and discouraged disciples: "Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing."—Luke 5:5. Why not end this vain and fruitless search and go to the first chapters of Genesis and read the beautiful and inspired account which the Almighty has given of His creations? But "the fool hath said in his heart, There is no

God.”—Ps. 14:1. Also, the Psalmist has said: “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.”—Ps. 24:1.

THE HUMAN EAR

When Darwin studied the eye, its beautiful and wonderful structures gave his materialistic vagaries “a cold shiver.” He might well have said the same thing of the ear which has such minute and multitudinous organs. While the eye which is the beautiful window of the soul, serves us only in the light, the ear always operates by means of the ever-present atmosphere. Consequently, some think that the loss of hearing is a greater deprivation than the loss of sight.

THE EXTERNAL EAR

The ear “is divided into three parts—external, middle and internal. The external ear consists of the pinna and auditory meatus.” Its outer rim is called the helix and anti-helix, etc. Then there is the concha, the largest and deepest cavity of the outer ear, leading into the meatus. “The functions of the external auditory meatus are (1) to conduct waves of sound to the membrana tympani, and (2) to afford protection to this membrane and the delicate structures in the middle ear.” “The protective function of the meatus is more important than any function it may perform of reflecting waves of sound upon the membrane. The tube protects the membrane in two ways: (1) By its varying curvature and by its length, and (2) by the secretion of cerumen. As regards the first, it is obvious that any foreign body entering the meatus will come first into contact with one wall and then with another, and may thus be arrested. Further, as the meatus is of considerable length (averaging 24 mm.) [about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch] in proportion to its transverse area, the air in its cavity maintains a fairly uniform temperature.

“By the secretion of cerumen, the entrance of foreign bodies, especially of insects, is prevented. Dust and small particles of foreign matter readily stick to the cerumen, and are thus hindered from passing inwards.

“The chemical analysis of cerumen shows water, fats and a yellow pigment. . . . Cerumen has a bitter taste and

an aromatic odor. Probably these qualities deter insects from entering the meatus."—Text-Book of Physiology, edited by E. A. Schäfer, Vol. II, pp. 1150-1.

THE MIDDLE EAR

Its function "is to receive sound waves occurring in the air, and to transmit the effect of these to the labyrinth." In the middle ear are the malleus (hammer), the incus (anvil), and the stapes (stirrup). These three bones are the conveyors of sounds from the outer ear through the membrana tympani which separates the middle ear from the outer one. "As the base of the stapes is opposite the vestibule" of the labyrinth, it is the first "to receive the mechanical impulse communicated by the chain of bones."—*Ibid.*, p. 1164. In this ear is found the Eustachian tube which connects with the pharynx, and serves "to equalize the air pressure on both sides of tympanic membrane." Also, in the middle ear the sound waves are intensified. Schäfer says: "Hence the pressure of a sound wave, acting on the membrane, is increased thirty-fold . . . when it acts on the plate of the stapes."—*Ibid.*, pp. 1152, 1158-9, 1164.

THE INNER EAR

Here are the minute mysteries and perplexities of our organ of hearing. It is composed of three parts—viz., the vestibule, the semi-circular canals, and the cochlea. It is thought that these semi-circular canals are like spirit-levels, and indicate the vertical and the horizontal—indicate equilibrium. "It is remarkable that some of the old anatomists conjectured, long before the discovery of Corti, that this part of the internal ear was in some way analogous to a musical instrument, having wires of varying lengths tuned to tones of different pitch."—*Ibid.*, p. 1168.

"In the cochlea there are vibrators, tuned to frequencies within the limits of hearing, say from 30 to 40,000 or 50,000 vibrations per second. Each vibrator is capable of exciting its appropriate nerve filament or filaments, so that a nervous impulse corresponding to the frequency of the vibrator is transmitted to the brain."—*Ibid.*, p. 1179.

"It is a striking testimony to the delicacy of the ear that between 32 and 2,048 vibrations per second we can observe

a difference of less than 1 vibration per second." "Within the range of human audition, we can hear about 97 tones between 16 and 64 vibrations per second, 4,800 between 65 and 1,024, 6,144 between 1,025 and 4,096, and 23 on the upper side of 4,097. This gives a total of 11,064 tones heard by the human ear. It is interesting to notice in this connection that the pitch of the highest tone of the piccolo stop of the organ is 4,096 vibrations per second, while the deepest tone of the contra bassoon is 27. These are the highest and the lowest tones used in music."

"The dimensions of the ductus cochlearis, the number of the rods of Corti, and the number of hair cells have been determined by competent observers. At a request, Dr. William Snodgrass made transverse sections of the cochlear division of the auditory nerve of an adult . . . and he carefully counted the number of nerve filaments. These were found to be about 14,000. It is obvious that all such estimates must be approximate."—*Ibid.*, p. 1184. "There are five rows of hair cells, one inner numbering about 3,500 and four outer numbering about 12,000."—*Text-Book of Physiology* (Hall), p. 478. The mystery of hearing grows as we study the ear.

It is certainly worthy of remark that when the ear makes its first appearance—so far as known to man—in water or on land, it is a finished product, complete of its kind, adapted to its environment. Further, there are always well-defined lines of demarcation between the ears of any lower species and those of any higher ones.

But what do the evolutionists say about species? The fact is that they can give no satisfactory definition of it. But theistic scientists know that *species implies unity of ancestry*; rather *species consists in unity of ancestry*.

How rational human beings can imagine that dumb animals have invented and constructed such a wonderful and serviceable an organism as the human ear, is really beyond comprehension. Then, the further wonder is that it has taken man nearly 6,000 years to merely understand the wonderful scientific mechanism of hearing which, according to them, the lower animals must have invented and constructed. Do agnostics really believe that the brute creation has dur-

ing the past invented and vastly improved their organs of hearing, seeing, etc.? Surely evolutionists themselves ought to keep up the march of progress, and further improve all our organs. One often hears infidels say that they could have made a better world. Let us have a few specimens of their superior wisdom and skill. *Our brilliant scientists* surely cannot allow themselves to be outdone by fishes and frogs, birds and beasts, apes and monkeys.

PSYCHOLOGY, BY JAMES

According to Professor William James,¹ of Harvard University: "The definition of Psychology may be best given in the words of Professor Ladd as the description and explanation of states of consciousness as such." But consciousness is merely the mind's realization of itself—is only one of our mental activities. Is it not, then, better to speak of the human soul or mind as possessing four attributes; namely, an intellectual, an emotional, a volitional, and a moral nature? Too many writers on psychology spend time on physiology and actually ignore our moral nature which is really the supreme part of human personality. Now, a plain definition of Psychology would be like this: Psychology is an inventory and a description of the attributes of the human mind. But some writers on this subject seem to be under mental bondage to old heathen Greek materialism, and they belabor themselves and their readers with vague circumlocutions, illogical generalizations and vain imaginings, which tend only to bewilder the student.

Professor James surely errs when he says: "Mental facts cannot be properly studied apart from physical environment," and actually asserts: "The great fault of the older rational psychology was to set up the soul as an absolute spiritual being with certain faculties of its own by which the several activities of remembering, imagining, reasoning, willing, etc., were explained, almost without reference to the peculiarities of the world with which these activities deal."—p. 3. But our mere materialistic psychologists try to explain mental phenomena without mind. They forget that in the inspired

¹The quotations in this chapter are taken from the Briefer Course of his psychology, published by Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1913.

account of our origin, two distinct acts of the Creator are recorded. First, He formed the body of Adam out of materials found in the earth. Secondly, according to the Holy Scriptures, God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of *lives*, and man became a living soul."—Gen. 2:7. Mark, it does not say that man became a living body, but "a living soul." Also, mark that the original has the plural—*lives*—and that means that the breath of the Almighty gave life to *both body and soul*. Consequently, modern agnostics are in grievous error when they imagine that one must depend upon physiology for an adequate treatment of the human mind. They forget that not the body but "*the mind is the man.*"

Again, is not the learned professor mistaken? He speaks of "psychology as a natural science." It is, rather, a mental science. This is a material age and blind materialism is putting its blight upon everything, and it may require a great deal of learning and clear-headed thinking to rescue psychology, philosophy and theology from the bewildering nomenclature of common infidelity. Strictly speaking, according to materialism, there is no such a thing as psychology and, consequently, recent works on psychology treat largely of physiology. This is confusing and unscientific.

Professor James himself in Chapter II treats of sensation in general; in Chapter III, of sight (the eye); in Chapter IV, of hearing (the ear); in Chapter V, of touch, the temperature sense, the muscular sense, pain; in Chapter VI, of sensation and motion; in Chapter VII, the structure of the brain; in Chapter IX, some general conditions of neural-activity; and in Chapter X, of habit. These subjects fill the first 150 pages of a book on Psychology which has, in all, only 478 pages. Thus we see that nearly one-third of his book is on physiology and not on Psychology. In this way the student is perplexed with these extraneous references to physiology. Thus it is comparatively easy to keep up the delusion and treat psychology as if it were physiology.

Then in Chapter XI, he begins what he calls, "The Stream of Consciousness," and informs us that the order of our study must be analytic; for according to him, "All pedants and abstractionists will naturally hate to abandon it" (the Synthetic). Now he states: "The Fundamental Fact: The

first and foremost concrete fact which everyone will affirm to belong to his inner experience is the fact that consciousness of some sort goes on. 'States of mind' succeed each other in him. If we could say in English 'it thinks,' as we say it rains or it blows, we should be stating the fact most simply and with the minimum of assumption. As we cannot, we must simply say that thought goes on."—pp. 151-2. Here is a clear case where his materialism breaks down. Our bewildered author does not like to say that molecules can think and reason, remember and imagine, and his intellect is so confused by materialism that he is afraid to acknowledge that the Almighty made man in His own "image" and "likeness"—made him an immortal, spiritual being "after the similitude of God" (Jas. 3:9), possessing intelligence, volition, emotion and conscience. The professor hardly presumes to say of man, "It thinks," and he is not as wicked as much over-estimated Emerson who, when asked what pronoun he preferred to use in referring to God, blasphemously replied that he preferred the impersonal pronoun *it*. Such an infidel should be consigned speedily to the realm of well-merited oblivion. But James blindly wanders through mazes of doubt and hesitation in his futile efforts at trying to explain mental phenomena without having either an *efficient cause* or a *sufficient reason*. Agnostics make desperate efforts to account for the Cosmos without a Creator. In the realms of psychology, science, philosophy and theology, agnostics are utterly in a maze of confused and confusing theories, suppositions and hypotheses.

On page 192, James makes ambiguous remarks about God. It ought to be affirmed that no satisfactory diagnosis of man psychologically can be made without recognizing the full significance of the *Fall of our First Parents*. Therefore, all agnostic writers wander about in meaningless phrases, vacant generalities, vague speculations, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."—2 Tim. 3:7. Their writings just bewilder their unfortunate students with feeble and erroneous statements that mislead the mind and torment the memory; for memory somewhat depends on reason.

Again, the professor asserts: "If we had other grounds, not yet considered, for admitting the Soul into our psychology, then getting these other grounds, she might turn out to be the known, too. But if there be no other grounds for admitting the Soul, we had better cling to our passing 'states' as the exclusive agents of knowledge."—p. 200. This hesitating statement indicates mental lassitude or debility. Why did he not study and find out whether the Soul of man was an entity or a nonentity? Is he contented blindly to go on following old heathen materialism? Ignoble souls may be content to wear the yoke of *uncertainty* and *mental bondage*. Also, many scientists are afflicted with mental depravity.

Further, he vacillates: "The logical conclusion then seems to be that *the states* of consciousness are all that psychology needs to do her work with. Metaphysics or theology may prove the Soul to exist, but for psychology the hypothesis of such a substantial principle of unity is superfluous."—p. 203. This is an amazing statement, and it means that even if there is no Soul, yet you can describe its activities and attributes. According to the author you do not need even to imagine that there is a Soul in order to write scientifically on psychology. This is rare science, but there is a good deal more of the same order among agnostics.

Again, the professor expresses himself: "This Me is an empirical aggregate of things objectively known." Did he mean that his existence was not real, but only an experimental aggregate, whatever that may be? Formerly, in the medical world, the empiric was known as a quack doctor.

MEMORY

"Retention and Recall: Such being the phenomenon of memory, or the analysis of its object, can we see how it comes to pass? Can we lay bare its causes?"

"Its complete exercise presupposes two things:

"(1) The retention of the remembered fact; and

"(2) Its reminiscence, recollection, reproduction, or recall.

"Now the cause of both retention and recall is the law of habit in the nervous system, working as it does in the 'asso-

ciation of ideas.'"—p. 289. But who or what starts the "habit"? Therefore, whence the law of habit? Whence his nervous system? Whence the association of ideas? Evidently the author believes that molecules can think and plan, etc., etc., and can work wonders. Surely man ought to be able to discern somewhat of the manufacturing processes. But what does he know about the *nexus* between the brain and the intellect? Evidently James imagines that molecules can remember, etc., etc., all of which is simply absurd. See p. 289.

But he continues: "Memory being thus altogether conditioned on brain paths, its excellence in an individual will depend partly on the *number* and partly on the *persistence* [author's italics] of these paths."—p. 292. Did the author ever see these brain paths or count their number? Also does not the word persistence indicate mind action?

But let us proceed: "One's native retentiveness," he says, "is unchangeable." *No amount of culture would seem capable of modifying a man's general retentiveness.*" [Italics of author.] "This is a physiological quality, given once for all with his organization; and which he can never hope to change."—p. 296. That a learned professor of a great University would make such preposterous statements is almost beyond belief. Are not the youth of our nation sent to schools, colleges and universities for the development and cultivation of their minds? Does not the study of the classics greatly strengthen the retentiveness of memory? Does not the study of mathematics develop the reasoning powers? Evidently in colleges more attention should be given to Logic and Mathematics and thus arrest this mania for fallacious reasoning. Does not philosophy tend to develop thoughtfulness? Really, the professor is mentally blind to both philosophical and revealed truth. It does appear that some instructors should be put through a rigid course for mental development that they might know the difference between facts and fallacies, and cease the use of loose inductive reasonings, which during the last fifty years have disgraced science, philosophy and theology.

PERCEPTION

But our brilliant (?) author has more to give us. "Perception and Sensation Compared—A pure sensation we saw above" (p. 12), "to be an abstraction never realized in adult life."—p. 312. This is a strange assertion. Does he really suppose that only children have sensations? Do not comedy and tragedy give both old and young sensations? Both music and Christianity have their blessed emotions. Then nature with her blue skies and brilliant sunsets, with her mountains and oceans awakens within the soul transports of joy. Through all our five senses there come welcome and unwelcome sensations.

However, he further affirms: "*That whilst part of what we perceive comes through our senses from the object before us, another part (and it may be the larger part) always comes out of our own mind.*" [Author's italics.] This is perfectly true, if the author means by "mind" our intellectual nature—our soul, our immortal spirit. But we shall see. "At bottom," he continues, "this is but a case of the general fact that our nerve centers are organs for reacting on sense-impressions, and that our hemispheres, in particular, are given us that records of our past private experience may cooperate in the reactions . . . If we try to put an exact meaning into it, what we find most natural to believe is that the *brain reacts* by paths which the previous experiences have worn, and *which make us perceive the probable thing*, i.e., the thing by which on previous occasions the reaction was most frequently aroused."—p. 329. [Italics by the professor.]

Evidently, by the phrase, "comes out of our own mind," he simply means, comes out of our own "nerve cells." Therefore his use of mind is quite misleading. *This is a common vice of agnostics.* Their overworked word "evolution" is an example. It properly means—the bringing out of a thing what is already in it. But plant life is not in matter, animal life is not in a plant, and human soul life is not in animal. *Thus the Word evolution just assumes the thing to be proved.* Indeed, assumption is generally the major premise with materialists. Really, this evolution hypothesis is only a great, scienceless assumption. And our author uses the word mind in the usual misleading manner. For, according

to his writings, he believes that molecular action is mind and that the ancient heathen delusions of the "Mud Philosophy" are scientific.

The learned professor only mentions "Hallucination" and "Illusion." He had no need to do more; for he has clearly illustrated them.

His chapter on The Perception of Space is in line with what has been given in previous chapters; for philosophically "the last remainder of physical objectivity is taken from space and time." *That is perfectly true.*

REASONING

"What Reasoning Is—We talk of man being the reasoning animal, and the traditional intellectualist philosophy has always made a great point in treating the brutes as wholly irrational creatures." Here is his definition: "Reasoning may then very well be defined as the substitution of parts and their implications or consequences for wholes."—p. 353. Better, reasoning may be called the mental act whereby we make comparisons and draw conclusions. Reasoning is more than a substitution. It rather operates by means of comparisons and makes inductions and deductions. Further, in the name of common sense, who makes the substitutions? And whence come implications? Are they not the product of a reasoning mind, and does not reasoning demand a reasoner?

But he continues: "The art of the reasoner will consist of two stages:

"First, sagacity or the ability to discover what part . . . lies embedded in the whole . . . which is before him." Since the author speaks of a reasoner, it is fair to ask, What does he mean? Does he mean that a nervous center is a reasoner? Does he mean that molecules can reason? If so, here is a case of dementia. When were molecules endowed with sagacity and the discernment of discoverers? But the author proceeds:

"Second, learning, or the ability to recall promptly . . . consequences, concomitants, or implications."—p. 354. But the ability "to recall promptly," or in any other way, is utterly beyond the reach of matter, and belongs exclusively to the realm of intellect.

Then he makes this strange assertion: "*There is no property absolutely essential to any one thing.*" [Author's italics.]—p. 355. Is not light an absolute necessity to human life on this globe? Is not a moral nature an absolute necessity to a normal personality? Why make such a sweeping assertion?

But further, he affirms: "*Thus there are two great points in reasoning.*" [Author's italics.] First, an extracted character is taken as equivalent to the entire datum as it originally came."—p. 360. But who did the reasoning and extracting? Who discerned and built the character, and who decided the equivalent and recognized the datum? Here is a fine illustration of the fact that with materialists their arguments are built on senseless assertions. Now he states his other great point. "*Second the character thus taken suggests a certain consequence more obviously than it was suggested by the total datum as it originally came.*" [Author's italics.] This is very illuminating. But how do molecules form character, make suggestions, and furnish datum?—p. 360.

The learned professor propounds two ponderous questions: "Why does it need a Newton to notice the law of the squares, and a Darwin to notice "the survival of the fittest"?"

Please do not place that science heretic Darwin beside the illustrious Newton; for while the latter's discovered laws are standing the test of time, Darwin's vaunted "survival of the fittest" has already been rejected, according to the humiliating confession of his own humiliated followers.

In closing this hopeless and helpless chapter, the professor speaks of animals and men. Of the former he says: "They are enslaved to routine, to cut-and-dried thinking; and if the most prosaic of human beings could be transported into his dog's soul, he would be appalled at the utter absence of fancy which there reigns. Thoughts would not be found to call up their similars, but only their habitual successors. Sunsets would not suggest heroes' death, but supper-time. This is why man is the only metaphysical animal. To wonder why the universe should be as it is, presupposes the notion of its being different, and a brute who never reduces the actual to fluidity by breaking up its literal sequences in his imagination, can never form a notion. He takes the world simply for granted, and never wonders at it at all."—p. 369.

This last sentence well describes the mental attitude of the agnostic. He just blindly takes for granted all the glorious attributes of his mind which God gave him at his creation, and wickedly denies their very existence. Then he mistakenly calls man a metaphysical animal. The expression, "man a metaphysical animal," is grandiloquently absurd. For it is quite difficult to define metaphysics. It has had so many meanings since the time of Aristotle. Probably the best one-word definition of metaphysics is this—Ontology, which just means *being*. But more fully it may be said that metaphysics treats of certain phases of ontology, psychology, cosmology and theology. But man as a metaphysician is absolutely and infinitely superior to an animal; for between "*them is a great gulf fixed*" by the Creator Himself.

EMOTION

"I now proceed," he says, "to urge the vital point of my whole theory which is this: If we fancy some strong emotion, and then try to abstract from our consciousness of it all the feelings of its bodily symptoms, we find we have nothing left behind, no mind-stuff out of which the emotion can be constituted and that a cold and neutral state of intellectual perception is all that remains. It is true that although most people, when asked, say that their introspection verifies this statement, some persist in saying theirs does not."—p. 379. Surely the author has forgotten himself here. Must there not be an introspector when and where there is introspection? Also, neither molecules nor animals can fancy or abstract, and certainly they do not possess consciousness. But most assuredly human beings are conscious of possessing a mind, or mind-stuff, as he calls it. Here James really presumes to deny us the possession of mind in its true sense, which denial outrages universal human experience. We feel, we know, we realize that there is something within us which we call spirit, soul, mind, or mind-stuff, as he chooses to call it, and which can look in upon itself and certify to itself concerning its own existence as distinct from and largely independent of its body and environment. His foregoing statement is simply a bold denial of a well-known fact. All normal persons have a realizing sense of their own presence and per-

sonality, and are able to distinguish their souls from their bodies. Only materialists with what may be called petrified and seared consciences, and only when under the evil spell of malign influences, can so delude themselves as to imagine that they cannot realize themselves.

Again, he is mistaken in affirming that for us emotion, disassociated from all bodily feeling, is inconceivable.—p. 380. As Christians we believe that the saints in Paradise are supremely happy without their bodies. Also, even the infidel may have a sorrow of soul in which his body has no participation and for which it has no alleviation. Our bodies are but the houses of clay in which we live. Reason, volition and conscience often act quite independently of emotion. In the presence of many psychological facts his "inconceivable" notion vanishes.

The author has some helpless paragraphs on fear which in some instances finds expression through the body; but it is not the body that fears. Such an idea is simply ridiculous. It is the mind that feels the terror which it may or may not express through the body; because the mind alone can discern the threatening conditions and serious consequences. These mindless agnostics in the nature of the case, are poor psychologists; because they are attempting the impossible; for they try to explain the phenomena of mind while at the same time they deny the existence of mind. This one fact accounts for the utter shallowness and ridiculous absurdities of their books on psychology. They can do very well in physiology, because that consists in an inventory and description of our bodily organs. But in the realm of psychology, which properly consists in an inventory and description of the faculties of mind, they are as helpless as a blind man who would undertake to paint a Madonna, or guide a traveler over the Rocky Mountains. These agnostic psychologists are both a provocation and a disgrace to Christian intelligence.

INSTINCT

But the author gives this very good definition: "Instinct is usually defined as the faculty of acting in such a way as to produce certain ends without foresight of the ends, and

without previous education in the performance.”—p. 391. In a word, it may be said that animal instinct acts spontaneously and normally.

But when the author talks about instinct in man, he uses the wrong word. The animal has instinct, but man has intuition. It may be that instinct might sometimes be applied to a young child. Instinct comes from a Latin word which means *to instigate, incite*, and is in all animals; but intuition comes from a Latin word which means *to look on* and has been called “immediate apprehension or cognition.” It is innate and pertains specially to intellect. Further, woman’s intuitions—first impressions—are proverbially true.

It is an ominous fact that these psychologists are so silent about conscience which may be called moral intuition. While it is not infallible, yet it is an ever-ready monitor which promptly utters the *ought* and the *ought not*. Verily, God has not left Himself, without a witness in the human soul. Conscience is a universal possession—universal as reason itself. Immediately after the Fall, Adam and Eve tried to hide themselves from the face of their Heavenly Father. Conscience rebuked them, and they were both ashamed and afraid. And ever since that sad event, the Fall of our First Parents, man has possessed a depraved nature, “the carnal mind which is enmity against God” (Rom. 8:7), and has ever been trying to hide from his Creator. What blind and wicked attempts have been made to reason God out of His own world! This whole material rage is a most pitiable manifestation of sinful man’s desire to avoid his Maker. Just ancient and modern, common, wicked unbelief is the source of all these senseless heresies in both philosophy and theology—heresies which afflict sadly the *learned world* today. Verily, sin is the only thing that is wrong in this beautiful Cosmos. The wiles of the wicked one are blinding the eyes of some learned professors and some eloquent preachers, and the blind teachers in both church and school are leading both students and hearers into the ditches of ignorance and unbelief to the eternal sorrow of immortal souls. Rest assured, God Himself knows the nature of man physical and psychological infinitely better than these anti-Christian agnostics know it.

THE WILL

The idea that molecular action under any possible circumstances could produce volition, is simply the essence of absurdity. But let us have the author's opinion on this subject: "*An anticipatory image, there, of the sensorial consequences of a movement, plus (on certain occasions) the fiat that these consequences shall become actual, is the only psychic state which introspection lets us discern as the forerunner of our voluntary acts.*"—p. 420. [The italics the author's.] But where does he get the "fiat"? He silently assumes it and again begs the question. The reading of these materialistic vagaries is a constant provocation to any truly thoughtful scientific reader.

However, hear this under the head of—"Ideo-Motor-Action. The question is this: Is the bare idea of a moment's sensible effects its sufficient motor-cue, or must there be an additional mental antecedent, in the shape of a fiat, decision, volitional mandate, or other synonymous phenomenon of consciousness, before the movement can follow?"—p. 422.

"I answer: Sometimes the bare idea is sufficient, but sometimes an additional conscious element, in the shape of a fiat, mandate, or express consent, has to intervene and precede the movement."—pp. 422-3. Here again fiat is mentioned and is just appropriated, the author being serenely oblivious as to its origin or cause. This volume simply overflows with self-creations. The evolutionists are experts at manufacturing philosophical inanities, and constantly violate the old Latin saying—*Ex nihilo nihil fit*—"From nothing nothing comes." Really it is useless to continue this discussion any further; for it is just a series of assertions and assumptions without cause or reason. Throughout this volume logic and science, philosophy and theology are absolutely ignored. The above are fair specimens of the shallow and fallacious reasonings of evolutionists. But in his Conclusion which follows *the author himself actually confesses that the foregoing statements are utterly unreliable*. Really, he is ashamed of his own stuff.

To the credit of Professor James, it must be added that in his Conclusion of this edition of his Psychology, he honestly

acknowledges the unsatisfactory nature of his work; for he says:

"When, then, we talk of 'Psychology as a natural science,' we must not assume that that means a sort of psychology that stands at last on solid ground. It means just the reverse; it means a psychology particularly fragile and in which the waters of metaphysical criticism leak at every point, a psychology all of whose elementary assumptions and data must be reconsidered in wide connections and translated into other terms. It is, in short, a phrase of diffidence and not of arrogance; and it is indeed strange to hear people talk triumphantly of 'the New Psychology' and write 'Histories of Psychology,' when in the real elements and forces which the word covers, not the first glimpse of clear insight exists. A string of raw facts; and little gossip and wrangle about opinions, and a little classification and generalization on the mere descriptive level; a strong prejudice that we *have* states of mind, and that our brain conditions them: but not a single law in the sense in which physics shows us laws, not a single proposition, from which any consequence can casually be deduced. We don't even know the terms between which the elementary laws would obtain if we had them (p. 464). This is no science, it is only the hope of a science. The matter of a science is with us. Something definite happens when to a certain brain-state a certain 'consciousness' corresponds. A genuine glimpse into what it is would be *the* scientific achievement, before which all past achievements would pale. But at present is in the condition of physics below Galileo and the laws of motion, of Chemistry before Lavoisier and the notion that mass is preserved in all reactions. The Galileo and the Lavoisier of psychology will be famous men indeed when they come, as come they some day surely will, or past successes are no index to the future. When they do come, however, the necessities of the case will make them 'metaphysical.' Meanwhile the best way in which we can facilitate their advent is to understand how great is the darkness in which we grope, and never to forget that the natural science assumptions with which we started are provisional and revisable things."—pp. 467-8.

Why would any thoughtful person publish a book that could cause its author to write such a pitiable and humiliating conclusion? *How true are the Holy Scriptures!* "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."—Deu. 32:31. Every false science and every false philosophy is doomed.

PSYCHOLOGY, BY CALDERWOOD

Prof. Henry Calderwood, LL. D., in his great work on "The Relation of Mind and Brain," says in the Preface: "The object of the present work is to ascertain what theory of mental life is warranted on strictly scientific evidence." He mentions "the facts unaccounted for by anatomical and physiological science and requiring to be assigned to a higher nature." "It is clear," he affirms, "that the known facts connected with cerebral action do not include familiar phases of mental activity. If we allow ourselves to be engrossed with Physiological investigations as to brain, we restrict our attention to a single class of facts, and become unable to take a view of life as a totality. The whole range of evidence must be traversed, if we are to secure a harmonious representation of the content of human nature."—Preface. In his first chapter he shows that our rational nature, which can unlock the secrets of the universe, most of all deserves attention." This gives Psychology a vast precedence over Physiology, and truly man's higher nature cannot be explained from a more material standpoint, but under the influence of mental and moral considerations. Calderwood shows that molecular action cannot produce the phenomena of mind.

It may be said in passing that agnostic physiologists have been blundering seriously in giving an imperfect description of man. In our creation God gave us—not three—but four of His divine attributes; namely, an intellectual, an emotional, a volitional, and a moral nature.

Now, materialistic Psychology is utterly incompetent to deal with these four attributes of man. Can molecules reason? Can they explain the operations of mind and their continuity? What about memory and the imagination? Can molecular action develop into the emotions of love, joy, envy,

hate? Is there a power in atoms to will? Can chemical affinities and repulsions explain the prompt and accurate decisions of our moral nature concerning right and wrong?

Consciousness, which is self-realization, is a distinguishing characteristic of man. According to Sir William Hamilton, "it is the recognition by the thinking subject of its own acts and affections." But Professor Calderwood¹ says: "Rather, it is the recognition by the thinking subject of itself and its own acts and affections." Now, this ability of introspection, self-consciousness, absolutely distinguishes the human being from all the lower orders of creation. True, animal instinct seems to make an approach to memory and reason. Yet, the animal is utterly unable to attain unto anything like self-realization. It can never affirm: *I am and I know that I am*. Of all mundane creations, only man who possesses that immortal spirit which the Creator "breathed into his nostrils" at his creation in the Garden of Eden—only man, who was created in the "image" and "likeness" of his Maker, possesses the mysterious power of self-realization. It has been well said: "While the knowledge of the internal self is by internal observation, the knowledge of the organism must be by external observation. There are thus two departments of science concerned with our existence, the Psychological . . . and the Physiological . . . These are quite distinct from each other, yet closely related, and capable of rendering mutual aid."²

Thus, though mind and body are correlated in one personality, nevertheless they are quite distinct, and were brought into existence by two distinct acts of the Almighty. Of course this self-conscious mind operating through its physical body, enters the realm of physiology, and on the other hand, when confining itself to intellectual faculties, its operations are purely psychological. This fundamental distinction is scientifically maintained by our learned author. Consequently, he does not fall into the manifold absurdities which so discredit the Psychological writings of Professor

¹See p. 4, Handbook on Moral Philosophy, by Rev. Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh.

²See p. 9.

James of Harvard, who has vainly attempted the impossible by trying to explain psychological phenomena on a physiological basis—which is *impossible*!

Calderwood states the case clearly: "The characteristics of our physical nature, and those of our purely intellectual nature, belong to distinct departments of science, the one physical and the other mental."¹ Of course, no one would ever think of applying the laws of mental action to the chemical affinities and repulsions of molecular action, and it is just as absurd to reverse the order and attempt to apply the principles of physiology to psychology; for mind and matter are entirely distinct entities and belong to absolutely different realms. "Kant, holds that 'Right cannot appear as a phenomenon' "²—for Right implies a moral law and that implies a moral personality which is absolutely not a product of animal life.

Further, man possesses intuition which is the wonderful gift of instant discernment. It resembles conscience, which gives "immediate recognition to the moral law." It can well be said that conscience and intuition come "from the depths of our nature"; that they are "the outcome of Personality"; and that "the knowledge of them is a necessary condition of an intelligent, self-directed life." Now, the mind, not grey brain matter, is the source of both conscience and intuition. Also, there are axiomatic and necessary truths which demand a rational origin—an origin which materialism is quite incompetent to provide. Just as matter has its great special laws, likewise reason is regulated by its own universal principles. Truly, it is evident that animal life and human life are utterly distinct—are utterly incommensurable. This absolute dissimilarity forever overthrows all these illogical theories about evolution.

"That a knowledge of the Deity belongs to man has been the general testimony of philosophic thought." "The reality of the Divine existence is a truth so plain that it needs no proof."—*Ibid.*, p. 228. Now, let these questions be asked: Can matter know God? Can plants know God? Can animals know God? Can even the brain cells of man by themselves and of themselves know God? A categorical *No* must

¹*Ibid.*, p. 13. ²*Ibid.*, p. 40.

be given in every case. *But man himself can and does know God.* It is often said, and well said, that the idea of a Supreme Being is universal. For at our creation there was stamped upon the human mind the Divine "image and superscription." This gives us a celestial rank and fellowship with angels and God, and forever places us in a rank of infinite superiority over all the other orders of creation in this mundane sphere.

The laws that govern animals are physical and instinctive; while the laws that regulate human life are not only physical, but are intuitive, mental, moral and spiritual. For man is not only of the earth, he is a social being with celestial affinities and destiny. Consequently, only the very minor part of his personality has anything in common with the brute creation. Thus he is separated and exalted in the scale of being, having divine kinship with angels and Deity. Therefore, to consider man as merely a developed animal is a monstrous violation of both common sense and reason. Such an idea is absolutely repugnant to all normal feeling and thinking. Even the benighted heathen have transcendent thoughts of their origin; for the Great-Spirit idea is universal and the recognition of our divine ancestry is intuitive in the human mind.

"It is clear that the known facts connected with cerebral action do not include familiar phases of mental activity. If we allow ourselves to be engrossed with Physiological investigations as to the brain, we restrict our attention to a single class of facts, and become unable to take a view of human life as a totality."¹ There is in man an "activity" which is "superior to the action and reaction of nerve tissue"; for we have "knowledge of a power superior to motor activity."² "And still further beyond these, we shall reach a class of actions which cannot be explained by any recognized activity either of the sensory or of the motor apparatus."³ Also, he says: "It must be remembered that there is a much higher range of intellectual actions than those concerned with the government of muscular power."⁴

¹Preface, pp. V and VI. This quotation and those following are from Professor Calderwood's great work entitled: "The Relation of Mind and Brain."

²Ch. VIII. ³p. 237. ⁴p. 261.

"Personality is the essential feature of human life."¹ But only the demented would ascribe personality to animals, and why? Because they lack all the essential attributes of that divinely-bestowed dignity. What blunders psychologists make when they do not "distinguish between nerve sensibility and intellectual activity"!

It is true that animals can utter sounds of warning, pain and joy, but they cannot attain unto a language, and why? Because they have not the necessary mentality; for "without intelligence, language cannot be acquired,"² and much less can it be originated. It is really axiomatic to say: "Mental activity is not an organic process." Man has mental experiences that cannot be ignored and that cannot be explained by physiology. But these experiences must be accounted for and that can be done only on the basis of true psychology. For instance, no molecular action in brain cells can account for memory or imagination, for conscience or consciousness, for will or the power of speech, for the Christian emotions of love, joy and peace, or for our moral and intellectual endowments. These enter into the daily human experiences of mortals, and demand a mental explanation. Further, they prove that the brain is nothing more than the instrument of the mind just as the body is only the dwelling place of the soul.

"Now we pass up into a higher region where mind is at the maximum of activity, body at the minimum."³ "When we come to contemplate man purely as a thinker, and consider the vast work which has been achieved by him, of which literature, poetry, art, science, philosophy and Christianity present the evidence, we recognize man apart from all other orders of being in the universe. Here there is no companionship of animal life. Man moves alone on a higher altitude and works unaided by lower forms of life which render service is subordinate work."⁴ Here is found a "*purely intellectual department of thought*," demanding purely mental activities.

It is quite natural and proper to use the foregoing statements in reference to human beings, but such expressions in

¹p. 285. ²p. 312. ³See p. 411. ⁴p. 412.

reference to animals are simply absurd. "From examination of these lower orders of activity we have found that comparison,—recollection of the results of past comparisons,—inference, and volition, are all characteristic of man, and cannot be accounted for under the laws of nerve action."¹

Further, when children "come to their seniors seeking help towards explaining how certain things happen, or why things are arranged in a particular way, they are engaged with forms of activity which are not accounted for by the laws of brain action."² "It is continuity of thought, along with improved appliances at command—not growing complexity of brain—which accounts for recent results"—such as the advancement in various departments of science and knowledge.³

"After referring to specific gravity and pathological conditions" of certain brains, "Dr. Herbert C. Major presents his general conclusion in the following terms: From these considerations it follows that we may have presented to us for examination two brains, equal in size and weight, equal also, so far as can be ascertained, in the number and depth of convolutions—that is to say, in the extent of the grey matter, the latter being similar also in its minute structure—and yet one may represent great intellectual power, the other quite an opposite condition."⁴ This unmistakably shows that intellectual and moral supremacy do not depend on the size or quality of the brain—do not depend on molecular action and fully sustains the contention that the brain is only an instrument of the mind.

Consequently, "the solution of any intellectual problem depends on personal concentration, continuity of thought, and persistence of wide-ranging reflection. The result is not such as could be estimated according to the cerebral development of the thinker." Again, our author says: "Concentration of thought, not as the result of impression from without, but as the result of personal impression from within, is not to be accounted for under the known laws of brain action."⁵ Even the "most enthusiastic upholders of the power of animal intelligence have not suggested that animals

¹p. 415. ²p. 416. ³p. 418. ⁴See p. 422. ⁵p. 423.

reflect upon a rule of conduct."¹ Necessarily so, for their theory absolutely breaks down in the realm of morals. "But with man there is a higher possibility, a new and higher source of activity belonging to a more complex nature, an impulse coming from an inner sphere, more remote from the external sphere whence animal life is ruled."² The animal's highest activity is instinct. It is not endowed with the immortal spirit that God breathed into man at the beginning.

Mere "physiology is so far from having surmounted the difficulties here, that it has not even the means of reaching them."³ For mental and moral reflections are absolutely beyond the reach of all forms of sensation. Even "a child is the judge of a grown man, and a correct judge, when he pronounces condemnation on pretences and falsehoods of his seniors."⁴ And why is this? Because the child possesses a nature which is far superior to that of even a mature animal of the highest species.

"To stand between the allurements of sense and an ideal of rational life; to recognize the duty of guarding against the former, and aiming at the fulfillment of the latter; and to accept it as one's life-work, to rise by years of patient effort towards this rational ideal; these are possibilities which seem to be altogether inexplicable under a scheme which traces the whole energies of life to the action of nerve cells."⁵ It is suitable only for agnostics and heathen to suppose that nerve cells could attain unto such mental and moral deliberations. "Rational life, therefore, implies personal superiority to impulse, and a regard to an intelligible rule of conduct as a uniform law of activity." This shows that thought which is only a product of mind—"that thought must govern."⁶ Calderwood says: "I have not seen any expositions of the functions of brain which can be taken as a scientific account of such mental occupation."⁷ Only thought can account for the mastery of strong impulses. All sane psychology must affirm that animal sensibility cannot afford an explanation of moral phenomena. All thoughts of God are infinitely above mere brain activity. Therefore, any Psychology that

¹p. 425. ²p. 426. ³See p. 427. ⁴p. 428. ⁵p. 429. ⁶p. 430. ⁷p. 431.

limits itself to the realm of Physiology is absolutely helpless in the presence of mental and moral phenomena. Also, we know that the "human mind deals with conceptions of the infinite." "These beliefs as to the existence of Deity and a future existing for the soul, may with accuracy be described as beliefs that are perennial and nearly or quite universal."¹ Indeed, the idea of God is innate in the human mind. According to Calderwood, even Herbert Spencer believed that "a candid examination of the evidence quite negatives the action maintained by some that creeds are priestly inventions"; for the very soul of man cries out for the living God. "How much deeper are human wants than the physical, appears in the universal prevalence of religious beliefs and worship."²

"In sight of such intellectual exercise and its results, the conclusion seems beyond dispute that the action and reaction of nerve tissue, mainly concerned with the primary demands of sensation and motion, can afford no explanation of the speculative thought which occupies a conspicuous place in literature."³

"In harmony with what has been ascertained to be true of the experience connected with sensation and motor activity, it appears that there is a phase of personal activity in the exercise of Memory as it provides for the recognized continuity of life, combining successive forms of sensibility and activity—such exercise of memory cannot be classified with motor activity."⁴ When materialism attempts to account for the phenomena of memory and imagination, reason and volition, conscience and consciousness, there is a total failure. The eye, the ear, the tongue—all depend on that invisible, immortal inbreathing of Deity imparted at our creation in the "image" and "likeness" of the Great First Cause.

Professor Calderwood comes to this great conclusion: "Mind cannot be explained under the conditions applicable to matter. The immateriality of the rational nature is clearly implied in the forms of activity which are peculiar to it."⁵ His contention is right: for *nothing in nature has ever been*

¹Ibid., p. 437. ²p. 438. ³p. 440. ⁴p. 442. ⁵Ibid., p. 447.

known to transcend itself. This fact is in harmony with reason and universal experience.

ANTHROPOLOGY

The following quotations are from the Bible Champion:—

Prehistoric physical or Anatomical Anthropology is a study by itself, but owing to our space limitations it must be generally abbreviated. In general it may be said, that among fair-minded investigators there is at present no question that the oldest human skeletons from the anatomical point of view were not a race inferior to men as they now walk among us.

Dr. Bruner-Bey, speaking of the most ancient skulls yet discovered, says this: "They surpass in size the average of modern European skulls, while their symmetrical form compares favorably with the skulls of many of the most civilized nations of modern times."

And it is now generally conceded by Anthropologists that differences in the Anatomical structure of prehistoric people are essentially the same as they are at present time, and that the dissecting rooms of any large hospital will show a range of peculiarities quite as great as is found in Anthropological research among prehistoric peoples.—The B. C., Aug., 1918.

The pseudo scientist who manipulates his pretended discoveries to discredit the Word of God, might be entitled to Paul's label attached to the Sorcerer, "Thou child of the Devil." We turn to Dr. McPherson for help and he says:

"As early as 1889, Professor Virchow, of Berlin, admittedly the ablest anthropologist of modern times, when summing up the results of investigation of this subject by himself and other leading scientists, covering a period of twenty years, declared: 'In vain have the links which should bind man to the monkey been sought. The so-called proanthropos, who should exhibit this link, has not been found. No really learned man asserts that he has seen him . . . Perhaps some one may have seen him in a dream, but when awake, he will never be able to say that he has approached him. Even the hope of soon discovering him has departed; it is hardly spoken of.' Later the same authority declared: 'The middle link has not been found, and never will be.'"

We will add another testimony from other scientific scientists in other numbers. Possibly Dr. Townsend's mar-

velous articles have already established our readers so they will not "stultify" themselves by declaring themselves as Haeckel did, "a descendant of *Pithecanthropus Erectus*."—The B. C., Jan., 1920.

Mr. Geo. Paulin says: "I have been dealing with a creed composed of speculative audacities, of imaginary cosmic forces and principles, of daring leaps into the unknown, that have no connection or correspondence with the known forces, processes and phenomena of nature, and that are demonstrably false. Nothing more crude, more unscientific in construction, more frivolously daring in invention, has been offered for the acceptance of humanity, since the amazing cosmic theories of the semi-Christian, semi-pagan Gnostic philosophies were formed."—*Ibid.*, June, 1920.

"Darwinism was a crude effort, under the ægis of professed science, to dodge the great and solemn fact that God made man 'upright,' 'in His own image,' and that He has given us a divine revelation to guide us that is a thousand times better and saner and safer to follow than all the clumsy guesses of men who, like the Israelites of old, entreat, 'Let nature as an impersonal, abstract force speak to us, and we will hear; but let not the living God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, speak with us, lest we die.'"

Again Wallace: "Materialism is the most gigantic foolishness"; "nothing in evolution can account for the soul of man"; "the difference between man and the other animals is unbridgeable."—*Ibid.*, Dec., 1920.

At an early date such men as Louis Agassiz, Joseph Henry, and Sir John William Dawson, foresaw the inevitable doom of this false and foolish theory. Also, even the Twentieth Century Club has at least reached the conclusion that, "The Darwinian type of evolution has been abandoned by all scientific men."

"The writer well knows that some of our 'theistic' evolutionists claim to have a Scriptural type of evolution. He challenges anyone of them to state his theory. It will be a pleasure to combat it."—*Western Recorder*.—The B. C., May, 1922.

Dr. Bateson very tersely expressed it:

"That particular and essential bit of the theory of Evo-

lution which is concerned with the origin and nature of species, remains utterly mysterious. We no longer feel, as we used to do, that the process of variation, now contemporaneously occurring, is the beginning of a work which needs merely the element of time for its completion; for even time cannot complete that which is not yet begun."

"The modern studies of the *chromosomes*, which are the parts of the cell nucleus supposed to be the carriers of the factors of heredity, are also emphasizing all these points.

"But, personally, I must confess that I have lost all faith in any scheme of Evolution which would seek to derive man from the lower animals, or which would endeavor to derive the various orders or classes of animals from some common original. All this is, in the light of modern developments, too wild a scheme to be dignified with the name of even a scientific theory. It is an unscientific pipe-dream."—Dearborn Independent.—Ibid., June, 1924.

SCIENCE NOT AUTHORITATIVE

Some ultra evolutionists will even affirm: "The conclusions of science are authoritative, while the conclusions of Theology have no formal authority." This is a most unwarranted assertion. Is it not a well-established fact among scientists themselves that books on science are remarkably short-lived. During the last ten years some sciences have made wonderful progress—have discovered so many new methods as to render obsolete whole libraries of scientific works. For instance, take the science of medicine. No longer the fever patient dies for the want of a drink of water. The late war literally revolutionized surgery. In 1895 the discovery by W. R. Roentgen of the X-rays made a profound impression upon the medical profession. The human body is now an open book, and the physician in making a diagnosis no longer needs to work in the dark.

And now comes Radium with its still greater mysteries and revelations of the properties of matter. This "metallic chemical element obtained from pitchblende, a Uranium mineral, by P. and Mme. Curie and G. Bemot in 1898," is one of the most marvelous component parts of this globe. It is evident that Radium and the X-rays are really revolutionizing the conceptions of scientists in many domains of knowledge.

Thus not only the surgeon and the physician, but the photographer, the chemist, the mineralogist must change ideas and modes of operation.

Further, helium gas which is lighter than air "(sp. gr. 0.139 referred to air)," and which is not inflammable like hydrogen gas, gives a new impetus to air navigation. Also in mechanics there has been a complete revolution. New inventions and new machinery are accomplishing wonders in every department of life.

Since science is ever advancing, it is ever changing. Both the art and the science of war have been revolutionized. What murderous advances have been made with poisonous gases and fiendish explosives! Swords are of little use and bayonets will happily soon be out of date. Also cavalry is on the retreat. Even the ten million dollar battleships are short-lived. Already great navies are rotting and rusting in the spacious harbors of the world. Mars, the god of war, is leaving the surface of the earth, and is ascending into the clouds and descending into the depths of the sea. Consequently, the whole science of fortification and strategy must be changed to meet these new conditions in the art of destruction. Thus change and decay characterize all things mundane.

But with "the Father of lights," there "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."—Jas. 1:17. Also, unchangeable is "the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."—I Peter 1:23. Our Blessed Lord is "the same yesterday, today, and forever," and the Third Person in the Holy Trinity is the "Eternal Spirit." Luke makes this fine statement: "To whom also He shewed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."—Acts 1:3. Note the phrase, *infallible proofs*. The New Testament is nearly 2,000 years old and parts of the Old Testament are nearly 3,500 years old, and yet the Bible has always been applicable to all Nations and to all Ages, and today this Word of God is the *most up-to-date Book* in the possession of mankind. In this Divine Revelation there is no need of change; for as Paul has said: "Ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God."—

I Thes. 2:13. That these inspired Scriptures were established in Heaven is made clear by the Psalmist who sang: "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."—Ps. 119:89. Our Holy Christianity rests upon this Divine Volume for its blessed doctrines of salvation and for its knowledge of the all-glorious Redeemer of mankind. Finally, therefore, Christian Theology is founded upon the Eternal Rock of Ages Himself as revealed in His Holy infallible Word. And its foundations are more enduring than the great mountains or even the vast constellations of heaven.

Bro. Feeble Mind may be troubled about inspiration. It simply means the impartation by the Holy Spirit of such a measure of supernatural aid as enabled the writers of the Holy Scriptures to record exactly, word for word, what the Lord intended should be written. Consequently, the original documents were *absolutely infallible*. Of course, in translations there have been some infelicities and minor inaccuracies. But no doctrine of our Holy Christianity has been affected even in the slightest degree. Our Blessed Lord in speaking of Himself as the Messenger of the Father, declared: "For I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment, what I should say. . . . Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak."—Jno. 12:49, 50. Jesus said: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself."—Jno. 14:10. If our Lord Himself had verbal inspiration, how much more did the prophets and apostles need verbal inspiration! Also, to the martyrs plenary inspiration was promised. The Saviour *told His disciples not to prepare answers to persecutors*: "But whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."—Mark 13:11. When necessary for an absolutely perfect revelation, the Lord gave the inspired writers of the Bible the *very words* required.

Surely the author of the following was under no celestial inspiration when he made this senseless assertion: "The conclusions of science are authoritative, while the conclusions of Theology have no formal authority." Science is the work of man and all the shores of time are littered with the wrecks

of thousands of exploded scientific theories. Really, the fallibility of scientists is one of the best-known facts of science itself. Paul was a most learned man, and earnestly warned his son in the Gospel: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called."—I Tim. 6:20. The shallowness of these evolution so-called scientists is only equaled by their effrontery. Thus far in the history of the world, the conclusions of science have very often had very uncertain authority.

It has been asked: Where do theories go when they die in Germany? It is answered: They go to England. And when they die in England, where do they go? They go to America. And when they die in America, where do they go? Well, it appears to some that they are smuggled into our institutions of learning and that the carrion is fed to the students. That is probably the reason why in some cases Christian freshmen become infidel seniors.

But Christianity is founded upon the Godhead. The true Church believes in the All-Father, and in His Blessed Son "who is co-equal and co-eternal," "of the same substance, essence and glory with the Father, and in the Holy Spirit," the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Also, we believe in the Holy Scriptures as the inspired Word of God. Further, Science treats of the works of God, while Theology treats of God Himself; but the Creator is infinitely greater than all His works and, therefore, Theology in both certitude and importance vastly transcends science; for science treats of mere material things, while Theology treats of eternal and spiritual realities.

Christianity is the supreme consideration, and certainly Theology which treats of its principles takes precedence of all other subjects, and is certified to by the best testimony in the possession of mankind. Science is an inferior consideration in the presence of Theology which is the *divine philosophy*, and its teachings are verified by the deepest convictions and realizations of the human soul. The true Christian knows God in his inmost being; for God dwells in him and he in God. Of this glorious fact both heart and mind have the clearest assurances in consciousness. We know whom we

have believed. "We know that we have passed from death unto life."—I Jno. 3:14. "Ye know that ye have eternal life."—I Jno. 5:13. "We know that the Son of God is come."—I Jno. 5:20. "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being."—Acts 17:28. There are no such certitudes in science as those which Theology reveals to the thoughtful seeker after "the truth as it is in Jesus."

Talleyrand was made a bishop in 1789, was excommunicated by the pope, was made president of the Assembly, was sent as minister of France to London, visited the United States, served under the Directory, helped to make Napoleon Emperor in 1804, during the July revolution was Louis-Philippe's chief adviser—to this astute church-man and world-man, whom Carlyle described as, "A man living in falsehood; yet not what you can call a false man"—to him one Lepaux, a fellow member of the Directory who had tried to get up a new religion, Theophilanthropy, complained that it made but little progress among the people; to him Talleyrand, "the amazingly clever, infinitely dexterous, and admirable judge of men," replied:

"I am not surprised at the difficulty you find in your effort. It is no easy matter to introduce a new religion. But there is one thing I would advise you to do, and then, perhaps, you might succeed." "What is it? what is it?" eagerly asked Lepaux. "It is this," said Talleyrand; "go and be crucified, and then be buried, and then *rise again on the third day*, and then go on working miracles, raising the dead, and healing all manner of diseases, and casting out devils; and then it is possible that you may accomplish your end!" The philosopher went away silent; and no infidel has succeeded in fulfilling these conditions.—*H. L. Hastings' Inspiration of the Bible.*

The foregoing is most seriously commended to the prayerful consideration of certain deluded college men who have been prating about a new religion and a new Christianity. Surely this must be a manifestation of the presumption of ignorance.

Indeed, the great doctrines of Theology have not changed. Sin and death and hell are today as they were 6,000 years ago. "The carnal mind is [still] enmity against God." Also

repentance and faith, pardon and salvation have not changed. The way of holiness which leads to Heaven is still frequented by rejoicing pilgrims. The Ten Commandments need no resetting. The royal law and the golden rule require no emendations. Today the Bible is "more to be desired . . . than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb."—Ps. 19:10. These destructive critics are a feeble folk compared with "the goodly *fellowship* of the prophets" and "the *glorious company* of the Apostles" and "the noble army of martyrs."

The Church still "looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun . . . and terrible as an army with banners."—Solomon's Song 6:10. Never before in the history of the world did Zion look so fair, never before did she shine with such radiance upon this lost world, never before did she march forth on her far-flung battle lines of world-wide missionary evangelism so hopeful for the conquest of the world under the Captain of our salvation. Today the banner of the cross is unfurled everywhere as the conqueror of ignorance and sin and as the patron of truth and righteousness. God Himself is speaking to the heart and soul of humanity with increasing power and emphasis. The armed and crowned Rider, seen by John in the Patmos Revelation, is going "forth conquering, and to conquer."—Rev. 6:2. And He will establish a permanent Kingdom of Heaven on foundations laid by the Almighty—a glorious Kingdom that shall last throughout eternity. Agnostic science is especially fickle and changeable—is human and erring; but true Christian Theology has its firm foundations in absolute truth and in the Eternal Himself.

Finally, as a rule, those so-called sciences which are at variance with the Holy Scriptures and which are the product of vagaries of sinful and ignorant men, are as uncertain and unreliable as the moods and tempers of their infidel authors. On the other hand the hallowed tenets of Biblical Theology are as stable and enduring as the throne of the Eternal Ruler of the Universe who sits in infinite power and majesty upon the circle of the Heavens.

EMBRYOLOGY

It is stated that the embryos of man, ape, monkey, etc., are alike, and, consequently, originally they have the same origin. But examine this strange assertion. All know that every embryo consists of two parts; namely, the life principle and a certain amount of matter. Of the life principle, it must be conceded that it is the major part, and about it *even scientists* are compelled to confess *total ignorance*. Who can explain the origin and nature of any kind of life? Life has always been an unknown quantity. Thus life, which is the major part of the embryo, must be represented by one-half plus, and of it man knows *absolutely nothing*.

Then, how much or how little is known about the matter part of the embryo? Do scientists know one-thousandth part, or one-millionth, or one-billionth part of its properties and possibilities? To both learned and unlearned alike, matter is a hidden mystery. Every day the sciences, especially chemistry and mineralogy, biology and zoology, etc., are revealing new mysteries about matter. Since, then, all are in total ignorance about the major part of the embryo, and since it is probable that man knows only an infinitesimal part of the properties of matter which is the minor part, most assuredly agnostics are in no position to dogmatize concerning the similarities between embryos. Remember that glass looks a good deal like diamonds, but the jeweler sees a vast difference. Also, iron pyrites, which is sometimes called fool's gold, resembles the precious metal; but assayers discern vast differences. And in the final results of embryos there are *incalculable differences* between the developed embryos—the human being is infinitely superior to the mere animal. Really, these utterly unscientific evolutionists are foolish propagators of astounding fallacies. They seem to have a mental avidity for the unreal and superficial—for any subterfuge that will save them from honest study and devout reverence for their glorious Creator. They are not faithful and clear-headed students of either nature or Revelation. The embryology of the evolutionist is a hideous scientific heresy.

THE DOWNWARD TREND OF HUMANITY

It has been asserted that the study of Anthropology "shows not only waves of development in the achievement of man, but the movement as it were of a great tide onward and upward." In answer to these assertions about "development" and "movement," "onward and upward," let us quote from the Holy Scriptures. They give the most rational and reliable accounts of origins and national movements in the possession of man.

In the first place we are informed by the Almighty Himself that He made man in His own "image" and "likeness." Therefore man was perfect physically, mentally and morally, at his creation. It has been well said that "Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam," and no doubt our first mother Eve was vastly more beautiful than the famous mythological Venus.

But oh! so soon comes the appalling fact that our First Parents fell into sin, and were of necessity expelled from the Garden of Eden. Then follows the first death which was a fratricidal murder—Cain slew his brother Abel. Thus the first man born into the world is the first murderer, and Abel's death is the first in the annals of time. Sad facts; the shedding of innocent blood begins early in human affairs. These appalling events are not achievements that cause boasting.

Further, listen to the inspired record of subsequent times: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth." "The earth was corrupt before God. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth."—Gen. 6:5, 11, 12.

Finally, in about 1,656 years the race had so deplorably degenerated that the Almighty was compelled to destroy by a Flood the whole human family with the exception of eight persons.

Also, that man has physically degenerated is proved by the fact that the period of human life has been greatly shortened. At the beginning, man lived nearly 1,000 years. Adam lived 930 years, Methuselah 969 years, Noah 950 years, etc. But in Gen. 6:3, it is written: "Yet his days shall be a

hundred and twenty years." What a tremendous physical degeneration has taken place—to drop from over 900 to only 120 years as the space of human life! These facts give an overwhelming refutation to the above mistaken assertions about "development" and "achievement," "*onward and upward*." For the awful and almost universal trend has been downward and perditionward.

But further, how did the Noachian peoples deport themselves after the Flood? Sad to say, they undertook to build a tower whereby they might defy the Most High Himself. Soon they forgot the true God and followed in the wicked ways of the Antediluvians. Then in 1921 A. M., only about 265 years after the Flood, the Almighty, seeing the general apostasy of mankind, called Abraham, that of his posterity He might make a chosen nation to work righteousness. For it appears that idolatry had become universal. This is the record: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor: and they served other gods."—Josh. 24:2. Also Laban, the grand nephew of Abraham, had gods in his home, which gods Rachel stole.—Gen. 31:30. Thus it is stated that in the family of Abraham's father there was idolatry, and that was not many decades after the Flood. How true is this ancient description of our race! "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."—Gen. 6:5. Even the history after the Flood does not show an "*onward and upward*" tendency.

But what about God's ancient people even after the Plagues in Egypt, the dividing of the Red Sea, the Revelations on Sinai, the Manna for forty years in the wilderness and the gift of the Holy Land? Surely a people that has enjoyed such miraculous deliverances and blessings will ever be faithful to the God of Moses—the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob.

Take a glance at the period from Joshua to Saul, which is the Transition from Theocracy to Monarchy—from 1451 B. C. to 1095 B. C.—a period of about 356 years. During these centuries judges ruled. Well, as usual, it is recorded that as soon as the generation died that knew Joshua, the

people fell into idolatry, worshiping Baal and Ashtaroath. There was just a constant succession of backslidings and repentings and deliverances. During this time there were fifteen judges or deliverers such as Othniel the first one, Deborah and Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, Eli and Samuel, the last of the judges. All through this book of Judges we find this sad statement: "And the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the Lord."—Judges 13:1. It was just a regular succession of apostasy and idolatry, repentance and deliverance. *Where is the imagined onward and upward tendency?*

Then, there came the period of the kings, beginning with Saul in B. C., 1095. Saul was a failure and caused a national lapsus. But David followed, and he was the great king, and under him the nation enjoyed an era of temporal and spiritual prosperity. Then came Solomon, the wise king, yet he loved pleasure and luxury, had many wives and concubines, imposed heavy taxes and allowed idolatry to be introduced into the kingdom.

Then, in 975 B. C., came the revolt of the Ten Tribes and the establishment of a second kingdom at Samaria. From that time on there were constant assassinations and revolutions. Nearly all the kings were bad and led the people into idolatry. Finally, in 721 B. C., Sargon, the son of Shalmaneser, and King of Assyria, took Samaria, and the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, called the Kingdom of Israel, passed out of existence laden with iniquity—*simply died of the disease of sin*. Israel literally rotted into the grave of national death—and she is not a very brilliant example of *advancement and achievement*.

The Kingdom of Judah, governed for the most part by unworthy Kings, was finally ended by Nebuchadnezzar in 588 B. C. There was a return from Babylon and a revival at Jerusalem, but never the reestablishment of the kingdom. Thus Judah lost her throne and her crown—and all through moral degeneration.

From the Return from Babylon to the time of our Blessed Lord, there was a sad decline—a sad ignoring of both truth and righteousness; and when the expected Messiah came, He found that the Holy City was just full of sanctimonious

hypocrites, and that Jerusalem was filling up the cup of her iniquity and preparing herself for one of the most awful sieges in all history.

But what is the testimony of modern times? Of course, the Good Lord poured out His Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost and there followed a most gracious and extensive Revival throughout the Roman Empire. "By a decree issued from Milan, A. D. 313, Christianity was made in effect the state religion." But in about 250 years more, real Christianity had well-nigh disappeared from the earth. For with the Fall of the Roman Empire in A. D. 476 the Dark Ages began and continued to "the opening of the eleventh century." That was probably the darkest and saddest period in human history. Then there came the dawn of a better day, when in 1517 A. D., Luther nailed his ninety-five Theses "to the door of the Church at Wittenberg." It is probable that the Reformation lifted the world from its deepest depths of depravity.

But sad to say that Germany, which was among the foremost nations in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, fell into all kinds of heresies, agnosticism, infidelity, even atheism, and, of course, evolution invaded her great institutions of learning, and poisoned the mental and moral life of the nation. There was also a return to the superstitions of the Dark Ages. Then this appalling religious collapse was utilized by a most brutal, selfish and fiendish imperialism, and the Kaiser headed the most formidable and hellish conspiracy against the civil and religious liberties of mankind that the world has ever known. *All history shows that downward has been the natural tendency of mankind educated or uneducated, civilized or uncivilized*—downward has been the universal trend when and where the Good Lord Himself was ignored.

Therefore, only by divine power and the supernatural grace of God inspiring His Church and destroying her enemies—only by Heaven's help in numberless divine interpositions and wonderful manifestations of the power of the Holy Spirit, only by stupendous overrulings of the laws and forces of nature, only by marvelous and oft-repeated manifestations of God's goodness and love in the realms of

grace and nature, only by these, has the human race been saved from self-destruction through wicked wars and moral degeneration. But at every great crisis in human affairs the Lord God of Hosts has arrested a sin-cursed and sin-maddened world and saved it from the awful chaos of utter and eternal perdition.

Now then, with both secular and Church history before us, how could any sane person assert—all the time ignoring the Holy Trinity and the Holy Scriptures and our Holy Christianity—"A survey of the facts in this field [of science] shows not only waves of development in the achievement of man, but the movement, as it were, of a great tide onward and upward"?

THE FAILURE OF EVOLUTION

In the Sunday School Times, Feb. 25, 1922, Professor George McCready Price has an article entitled, "Throwing Darwin's Theory Overboard," in which he says in part: "Among other things Dr. Scott said: 'For the moment, at all events, the Darwinian period is past; we can no longer enjoy the comfortable assurance which once satisfied so many of us, that the main problem had been solved—all is again in the melting-pot. By now, in fact, a new generation has grown up that knows not Darwin.'"

"The remarks of Bateson are very closely similar to the remarks of Dr. H. D. Scott, before" a "British Association for the Advancement of Science on September 9th of last year at Edinburgh, as quoted in 'Nature' for September 29, 1921."

Again, Professor Price continues: "And I am convinced that science is making substantial progress. Darwinism has been definitely outgrown. As a doctrine it is merely of historical interest. True, the current teachings of geology still occupy the center of the stage, and the real modern discoveries which completely discredit these teachings are only beginning to get a hearing. *The New Catastrophism is the theory of tomorrow in the science of geology*; and under the teachings of this new view of geology the whole theory of evolution will take its place with many 'perishing dreams and the wrecks of forgotten deliriums.' And at that time the entire teachings of science along these lines will be

found to be in complete harmony with the opening chapters of the Ancient Hebrew Scriptures. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' "

Now, did the great Carlyle make a mistake when he called evolution "the gospel of dirt," and when he called Huxley a fool? Remember the inspired Psalmist twice says: "The fool has said in his heart, There is no God."—Psalms 14:1 and 53:1. Ruskin called Darwin "a dim comet wagging its tail of phosphorescent nothing against the steadfast stars."

Professor Luther T. Townsend, in his "Collapse of Evolution," affirms concerning it that it is supported by "not one single well-established fact in the whole domain of science, philosophy or religion."—p. 5. The following recent titles are significant: "Bankruptcy of Evolution," "Collapse of Evolution," "Passing of Evolution," "Death Knell of Evolution," "Indefinite and Confused Movement of the Age," etc.

There have been numberless vague theories about the origin of life on this planet. Scientists have invented such terms as bathmism, cosmic ether, cosmic emotion, germ plasm, pangenesis, protoplasm, growth force, vital fluid, etc., etc. In their desperate efforts to account for the origin of life, scientists have acted as if *words could create things*. "Professor Huxley's confession of faith was this: 'Protoplasm is the origin of life . . . It is a molecular machine, all-powerful and all-sufficient.' " "But in his experiments with it Prof. Murray discovered that sea water and alcohol mingled gave a flocculent precipitate which, separated from the liquid, was identical with Huxley's protoplasm."—Ibid., p. 7. But scientists no longer talk of spontaneous generation. They confess that "the beginnings of life came upon the earth in some way unknown to science."

However, the professor of physiological chemistry in the University of Chicago, is reported to have said: "The divine creation of life is a pure humbug. Life is made up of certain organic compounds. Life originally happened." These bald and bold assertions "challenge the wisdom not only of prophets, apostles and our Lord Himself but also of scientists who have devoted their lives to the investigation of nature's phenomena and who have taken rank in the past and who

take rank today with those whose standing has been the highest in their several departments of study,—such men as Agassiz, Beale, Carpenter, Dana, Dawson, Faraday, Forbes, Gray, Helmholtz, Herschel, Lord Kelvin, Leibnitz, Lutze, Marray, Pasteur, Romanes, Verdt and hundreds of others who ascribe to God, and to God alone, the power to originate life. The distinguished physicist Clark Maxwell, speaking of the several defunct theories of evolution, says: ‘I have examined all that have come within my reach, and have found that everyone must have a God to make it work. Professor E. D. Cope introduced into his scheme a supposed something that he named ‘protoplasmic consciousness.’”—Ibid., pp. 8 and 9. That is probably the best imaginary deity that evolution has invented.

Even Professor Cope, “a pronounced evolutionist until just before his death,” said: “Retrogradation in nature is as well established as evolution.”

Concerning the human race secular history as well as Church history shows that man naturally degenerates. Professor Townsend states: “If history warrants any statement, it is that except for a mind endowed at the outset with a conscience, with which organic evolution has nothing to do, and had no religion, especially the Jewish and Christian, with their inspiring and uplifting power come to the aid of the human race, mankind through natural tendencies long since would have disappeared forever from the face of the earth.”—Ibid., p. 14. In wicked desperation, man in all ages has been trying to break the golden chain that binds the world to the throne of the Most High. “In the year 1806 the French Institute enumerated no less than eighty geological theories which were hostile to the Scriptures.”—Ibid., p. 18.

“Dr. James G. Walsh, professor of psychology at Cathedral College, New York, while addressing the City Club, of Boston, December, 1916, made the following statements: ‘The cave man of 20,000 years ago was more civilized and further advanced than we are today. And I want to suggest to you that the monkey is the degeneration of man, rather than that man has evolved from the monkey. . . . Man has not progressed.’”—Ibid., p. 29. Though the doctor followed the above with some wild statements which need not

be recorded, yet he is right about man being naturally a degenerate, and it is vastly more reasonable to believe that monkeys came from men than that men came from monkeys. It is stated that some are teaching that now—it is more reasonable.

“So, too, the science of comparative religion, at almost every point, furnishes damaging evidence against the assumptions of evolutionists.” Also, “Professor Schlegel reached a conclusion that since his day has been concurred in by all workers in this field of research: ‘The more I investigate ancient history, the more I am convinced that the nations set out from a true worship of the Supreme Being.’”—*Ibid.*, p. 31.

Every one that is at all mentally and morally normal must see that this insane evolution is coordinated with everything that is vile and atheistic—is bound up in sympathy and thought with all the evil forces of sin and wickedness. “In a book entitled, ‘The Science of Power,’ Benjamin Kidd shows that the theory of Evolution as presented by Nietzsche has a dominant tendency to paralyze everything in human life that is worth while. This is what he says: ‘It denounces Christianity as being a system calculated to make degenerates out of men, denies the existence of God, overturns all standards of morality, eulogizes war as being both necessary and desirable, praises hatred because it leads to war, denies sympathy and pity any rightful place in a manly heart and endeavors to substitute the worship of the superman for the worship of Jehovah.’”—*Ibid.*, p. 35.

This is the poisonous plant of evolution in full bloom, and let every one that has been afflicted with its virus, stand aghast at the imminent peril of our free country—peril of our boys and girls in our institutions of learning. We have refrained from dwelling on its social vileness, because the subject is too loathsome for public discussion.

THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

A glance at the grammars of the Romance language will convince one of their comparative simplicity. The Spanish is easily learned. In the French there are some peculiarities about silent letters and pronunciation. But the treatment

of the noun and the conjugation of the verb are both quite simple. The German is a little more difficult. Even the definite article has singular and plural, masculine, feminine and neuter forms; and for nouns there are four cases—nominative, genitive, dative and accusative. But there are only two declensions of the verb. Our own language, the English, though it is composed of various elements, is yet quite simple in structure.

But the Latin noun has six cases, namely: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative and ablative. The verb has two voices, three definite moods, six tenses and four conjugations. There are also irregular verbs. The Latin is thus more highly articulated than the Romance group.

In the Greek there are breathings, and vowels and consonants are subject to laws of euphony. Further, there are accents, three numbers, a dual, and three genders and five cases, omitting the ablative of the Latin. The treatment of the adjective is quite minute; for it must agree in gender, number and case with its noun. Thus, in declining an adjective or a noun over thirty forms must be given. Also, the Greek verb gives many shades of meaning. It has three voices—active, middle and passive, and there are four moods—indicative, subjunctive, optative and imperative, and there are seven tenses without counting the second aorist.

But the Sanskrit is doubtless the most minutely and elaborately constructed form of speech known to man. In dealing with nouns, adjectives and verbs, it is far more accurate and discriminating than the Romance languages, or even the classics. Therefore, these latter are much more easily mastered than this ancient language which is the mother of many tongues. To speak and write Sanskrit correctly required a high degree of scholarship. Panini, who is placed by some "in the seventh century, B. C.," and by others about 350 B. C., is called "the greatest known grammarian of ancient India whose work up to the present day remained the standard Sanskrit grammar. . . . The precision of statement and the analytical skill of his work are equally admirable."—Ch. En. According to some, Sanskrit may be considered "the oldest daughter of the old mother tongue." Even the Hebrew though it possesses a surpassing richness in expressing moral

and spiritual ideas and feelings, yet its grammatical structure is far less elaborate and far less difficult to acquire.

"It seems," writes Max Müller, "almost hopeless for a European scholar to acquire that familiarity with the intricate system of Pānini which the Pandits of the old School of India still possess; and although some of their refinements in the interpretation of Pānini's rules may seem too subtle, yet there can be no doubt that these living guides are invaluable to us in explaining the gigantic labyrinth of ancient Sanskrit grammar."—Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, p. XIII.

A writer in the *En. Br.*, eleventh edition, says:

"The origin of comparative philology dates from the time when European scholars became accurately acquainted with the ancient language of India." "To the Sanskrit the antiquity and extent of its literary documents, the transparency of its grammatical structure, the comparatively primitive state of its accent system, and the thorough grammatical treatment it has early received at the hands of native scholars must ever secure the foremost place in the comparative study of Indo-Germaine speech."

"The Sanskrit alphabet consists of the following sounds:

"(a) Fourteen vowels, viz:

Ten simple vowels: a, ā, i, ī, r, ṛ, u, ū, li, lī, and

Four diphthongs e, ai, o, au

"(b) Thirty-three consonants, viz:

Five series of mutes and nasals:

Guttural: k kh g gh ṅ

Palatal: c ch j jh ñ

Lingual: ṭ ṭh ḍ ḍh

Dental: t th d dh

Labial: p ph b bh m.

Four semi vowels: y r l v (w)

Three sibilants: palatal ś (c), lingual ṣ (sh), dental ṣ; and

A soft aspirate: h.

But this is not the whole complexity.

As an example of the minute elaboration of this language, here follows a copy from a page in Max Müller's grammar on "Personal Pronouns." There are eight cases but only seven are given here, the vocative being omitted. Also the Sanskrit letters are omitted.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Singular

N.	ahám	I	tvám	thou
A.	mám	me	tvám	thee
I.	máyâ	by me	távyâ	by thee
D.	máyhy-am	to me	túbhyam	to thee
Ab.	mát	from me	tvát	from thee
G.	máma	of me	táva	of thee
L.	máyi	in me	tváyi	in thee

Dual

N.	âvám	we two	yuvám	you two
A.	âvám	us two	yuvám	you two
I.	âvábhyâm	by us two	yuvábhyâm	by you two
D.	âvábhyâm	to us two	yuvábhyâm	to you two
Ab.	âvábhyâm	from us two	yuvábhyâm	from you two
G.	âváyob	of us two	yuváyob	of you two
L.	âváyob	in us two	yuváyob	in you two

Plural

N.	vayám	we	yûyám	you
A.	asmán	us	yushmán	you
I.	asmâbhih	by us	yushmâbhih	by you
D.	asmábhyam	to us	yushmábhyam	to you
Ab.	asmát	from us	yushmát	from you
G.	asmákam	of us	yushmákam	of you
L.	asmâsu	in us	yushmâsu	in you

The following are the cases whose initials are given above: Nominative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Genitive, and Locative. The Vocative is not used with these pronouns.

The List of Compound Consonants

They make a most formidable array. Even to copy these compounds and their English equivalents would require hours; for Sanskrit letters somewhat resemble Chinese characters. Not being able to print the originals, two lines of equivalents in our letters are given, and are as follows:

k-ka, k-kha, k-cha, k-ta, k-l-ya, k-t-ra, k-t-v-ya,
k-t-va, k-na, k-n-ya, k-ma, k-ya, k-ra, k-r-ya, etc., etc.

In all there are about thirty-six lines of Sanskrit characters represented by combinations of our letters similar to those above; and these characters number about 241. See Max Müller's Grammar, pp. 8 and 9. It must be confessed that our vocal organs are not adjusted accurately enough to express the fine distinctions of sound indicated by these compound consonants. Also, are our ears sufficiently attuned to distinguish between such minute differences of sound? There is here an indication of degeneration in our race. Of course before the Flood men used to live nearly 1,000 years, but now they live only nearly 100 years. Evidently we are in a world of degeneration. Christianity is our only preservative against physical and moral decay.

Chapter II contains about fifty-three pages and the subject of the chapter is: Rules of Sandhi or the Combination of Letters. About the first thirty of those pages are taken up with what is called External Sandhi and nearly all the rest of the fifty-three with Internal Sandhi; but both refer to changes in letters. Therefore euphony had a large place in Sanskrit.

When it is remembered that Pānini, who was probably the greatest of all grammarians, and who wrote a grammar of what is probably the most minutely and scientifically constructed language ever spoken by man—when it is remembered that this grammar was written about 200 or 300 years before Aristotle commenced his metaphysics, there must have been a remarkably high state of learning and culture to pro-

duce a language so "accurately made, polished and refined." According to a writer in the last edition of the *En. Br.*, "the Sanskrit language . . . represents the easternmost branch of the great Indo-Germaic, or Aryan, stock of speech. Philological research has clearly established the fact that the Indo-Aryans must originally have migrated into India from the northwest."—p. 156.

Further, the Sanskrit is vastly superior to the hieroglyphic of Egypt and the cuneiform of Assyria, Babylon and Media. Now, the Chinese language is utterly dissimilar to the Sanskrit, and may be called a monosyllabic language largely made up of just verbs and nouns. However, both of these forms of speech are rich in literature, possessing celebrated poets and writers. The Sanskrit literature has a "vast range," and it readily divides itself into two principal periods—the Vedic and classical."

THE VEDIC PERIOD

"The term veda—i.e., 'knowledge,' (sacred) 'love'—embraces a body of writings the origin of which is ascribed to divine revelation, and which forms the foundation of the Brahmanical belief. The sacred canon is divided into three or . . . four coordinate collections, likewise called Veda: (1) the Rig-Veda, or love of praise (or hymns); (2) the Sâma-Veda, or love of tunes (or chants); (3) the Yajur-Veda, or love of prayer (or sacrificial formulas); and (4) the Atharva-Veda, or love of the Atharvans. Each of these four Vedas consists primarily of a collection . . . of sacred, mostly poetical, texts of a devotional nature. . . . The entire body of texts . . . is also frequently referred to as the . . . threefold wisdom of hymn, tune and prayer." It should be mentioned here that the Brahmanical religion finds its practical expression chiefly in sacrificial performances."—*En. Br.*, p. 160.

"The six branches of Vedic science, included under the term Vedāṅga, are as follows."—*Ibid.*, p. 161.

1. Phonetics. 2. Metre. 3. Grammar. 4. Etymology. 5. Astronomy. 6. Ceremonial.

The foregoing shows us that these people possessed linguistic ability of a remarkably high order, and also that they were profoundly reverential to sacred things. Pāṇini's

grammar and these Vedas make known to us the state of language, learning and literature in a period about midway between the Flood and our Christian Era—between Noah and our Blessed Lord.

All this is in fullest harmony with the Holy Scriptures. According to the Inspired Word, Noah came down from Mount Ararat, which is between the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea. Then after the confusion of tongues a migration started southeast and found its way into the Punjab and finally going south it reached the fertile plains of India, where they attained a high degree of civilization.

There is a rich Sanskrit literature. "The Hindus, like the Greeks, possess two great national epics . . . 'the great (poem or tale) of the Bhāratas' is not so much a uniform epic poem as a miscellaneous collection of poetry. . . . The authorship of this work is aptly attributed to Vyāsa, 'the arranger,' the personification of Indian diaskeusis!"—En. Br., p. 167. "The complete work consists of upwards of 100,000 couplets—its contents thus being nearly eight times the bulk of the Iliad and Odyssey combined. It is divided into eighteen books, and a supplement, entitled Hari-vamsa, or genealogy of the god Hari (Krishna-Vishnu)."—Ibid., p. 168. From all accounts these ancients were prolific authors. Not being so very far removed from Noah, they still had a saving measure of divine knowledge. Be it remembered that as man degenerates in true religion, he correspondingly degenerates in mentality. It is significant that bald and bleak infidelity does not produce fine music, fine art, or fine literature.

"The insufficiency of the above classification, however, appears even from the fact that it omits the Vāyu-purāna, probably one of the oldest of all, though some MSS substitute it for one or other name of the second group. The eighteen principal Purānas are said to consist of together 400,000 couplets"; that is 800,000 lines, which would make over 30 volumes of 500 pages each. These ancients were prolific writers.

"2. *Puranas and Tantras*—The *Puranas* are partly legendary, partly speculative, histories of the universe, compiled for the purpose of promoting some specially, locally preva-

lent form of Brahmanical belief. They are sometimes styled a fifth Veda, and may indeed in a certain sense be looked upon as the scriptures of Brahmanical India. The term *Parāna* signifying 'old,' applied originally to prehistoric, especially cosmogonic, legends, and then to collections of ancient traditions generally. The existing works of this class, though recognizing the Brahmanical doctrine of the Trimūrti, or triple manifestation of the deity (in its creative, preservative and destructive activity) are all of a sectarian tendency, being intended to establish on quasi-historic grounds the claims of some special god, or holy place, on the devotion of the people."

"3. *Artificial Ethics and Romances.* In the early centuries of the Christian era a new class of epic poems begins to make its appearance, differing widely in character from those that had preceded it. The great national epics, composed though they were in a language different from the ordinary vernaculars, had at least been drawn from the living stream of popular tradition, and were doubtless readily understood and enjoyed by at least the educated classes of the people. The later productions, on the other hand, are of a decidedly artificial character. . . . They are, on the whole, singularly deficient in incident and invention, their subject matter being almost entirely derived from the old epics.—*Ibid.*, p. 170.

Here this miserable evolution theory fails again. It is evident that in literature and religion, which are the best criteria in this matter, there is found not development but degeneration. It is the universal testimony of both sacred and secular history that where man is deprived of divine inspiration and supernatural moral influences, he invariably degenerates.

"4. *The Drama.*—The early history of Indian drama is enveloped in obscurity. The Hindus themselves ascribe the origin of dramatic representation to the sage Bharata, who is fabled to have lived in remote antiquity and to have received this science directly from the god Brahman, by whom it was extracted from the Veda." "The existing dramatic literature is not very extensive."—*Ibid.*, pp. 171 and 172.

Also, there were laws and systems of philosophy. Here is a very brief example of their philosophy:

"The *Vedanta* philosophy, in the comparatively primitive form in which it presents itself in most of the older Upanishads constitutes the earliest phase of sustained metaphysical speculation. In its essential features it remains to this day the prevalent belief of Indian thinkers, and enters largely into the religious life and convictions of the people. It is an idealistic monism, which derives the universe from an ultimate conscious spiritual principle, the one and only existent from eternity—the *Atman*, the Self, or the *Purusha*, the Person, the Brahman. It is this primordial essence or Self that pervades all things and gives life and light to them, 'without being sullied by the visible outward impurities or the miseries of the world, being itself apart'—and into which all things through knowledge, ultimately resolve themselves. 'The wise who perceive him as being within their own Self, to them belongs eternal peace, not to others.'

"Thus the *Katha-upanishad* offers the following summary: 'Beyond the senses (there are the objects; beyond the objects) there is the mind (*manas*); beyond the mind there is the intellect (*buddhi*), beyond the intellect there is the Great Self. Beyond the Great One there is the Highest Undeveloped (*Avyaktam*); beyond the Undeveloped there is the Person (*purusha*), the all-pervading characterless (*alinga*). Whatsoever knows him is liberated and attains immortality.'"—*Ibid.*, pp. 177-8.

How immensely superior to our modern materialism is the above quotation! It speaks of "mind" and "intellect," "the Great Self," and "the Great One," and speaks of the "Highest Undeveloped." Also it mentions "Person" and furthermore affirms: "Whosoever knows him is liberated and attains immortality." These luminous statements indicate that blessed lingerings of happy Eden revelations were still holding a place in their beclouded and darkening minds. These equivocal and yet wonderful statements betray the gradual lapsus of the depraved human mind in its backsliding from a primitive, clearly-stated theistic Revelation of God as the Creator and Friend of mankind; while on the other hand, these conceptions are immensely superior to the vile animalization of our race in this modern abominable materialism. As we go backward in time—ascend this downward trend—

we inevitably find ourselves in the beautiful Garden of Eden where, according to the Holy Scriptures, Our Heavenly Father created our First Parents, Adam and Eve.

These statements are of immense value. While they are hesitating and cannot possibly be reconciled with one another yet they lead the thoughtful reader back to a time when there was a fuller and a mentally satisfying knowledge of celestial truth. These philosophical implications are really wonderful revelations. Also, it is evident that these ancients were losing their firm faith in the Divine Personality and allowing that faith to be dissipated in, what may be called, a diffusion of Deity throughout His glorious works of nature. The beclouding of the minds of men had set in, and they had no Moses and Joshua, no Isaiah and Daniel, to remind them of primitive purity and simplicity, truth and righteousness.

Therefore, in succeeding generations the darkness deepened until finally the fall of dismal night settled down upon the lands of the Indus and the Ganges. Even in our own country this awful blight of spiritual death has afflicted many with intellectual and moral atrophy. Today in our favored age of the world we have materialists—have them in spite of the goodly fellowship of the prophets, and “the glorious company of the apostles”—in spite of the infinitely blessed life and ministry of the Son of God. Our Christian civilization has been disgraced by such mental degenerates as Darwin, Spencer, Haeckel, et al., who, it seems, did not believe even in pantheism, but insanely deified mud, plants and animals. The imaginary deities of Greece and Rome are far superior to those of our modern materialists.

Mention should be made of Lexicography—there were Sanskrit dictionaries. In the distant past flourished famous lexicographers, as well as writers of prose and learned teachers of rhetoric. “Treatises on the theory of literary composition are very numerous.” There were celebrated composers of Music. “The musical art has been practised in India from early times.” Also, medicine had a large place in their consideration. The early cultivation of the healing art “is frequently alluded to” in the Vedic writings.—Ibid., pp. 181-2.

The writer of this fine article in the *En. Br.* on the Sanskrit has made a most important statement which is as follows:

"It is self-evident that so complicated and complete a system of linguistic analysis and nomenclature could not have sprung up all at once and in the infancy of grammatical science, but that many generations of scholars must have helped to bring it to the degree of perfection which it exhibits in Pāṇini's work. Accordingly, we find Pāṇini himself making references in various places to ten different grammarians, besides two schools, which he calls the 'eastern' and 'northern' grammarians."—*Ibid.*, p. 180.

Most emphatically neither cave-dwellers nor arboreal climbers gifted with prehensile caudal appendages ever helped to create the intellectual powers that produced the Sanskrit language and literature. That language was started by the Almighty Himself only about 1,500 or 1,600 years before the birth of Pāṇini when the speech of the builders of Babel was confused, and the people were scattered to the four quarters of the earth.

It is the judgment of such linguists as Du Ponceau, Charlevoix, Appleyard, Threlkeld, Caldwell, Dr. Latham, and Max Müller, that many branches of the sporadic family of languages have such richness of expression, and are so perfect and artistic in structure, that they could not possibly have been wrought into their present forms by the peoples now speaking them. The rational, and the only rational, conclusion is that those who now speak these tongues must have sprung from an ancestry who, in character and culture, were far in advance of their descendants.

One of the most recent and careful authorities on the languages of the American aborigines is Mr. Horatio Hale. In a paper published in the "*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*," he announces, as the conclusion of his investigations, the unqualified conviction that "the original framers or users of the languages of America were a cultivated and an intellectual people, and these tongues as they are now spoken are a clear case of race-degeneration."—*The B. C.*, Jan., 1917.

Our recent higher—rather, destructive—critics have been trying to show that the Pentateuch must have been written not very long before the Christian era, because at the time of Moses they thought there was no language sufficiently developed to give expression to its moral law and ceremonial rites. Now, if they had just given a little study to linguistics they would have discovered that not far from Persia there must have been before Moses was born a wonderfully minutely and accurately constructed language—a language whose grammar requires vastly more study for its mastery than that of any European language of present or past time. It was a desire to refute the unscholarly arguments of these deluded critics against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on the ground that no language of that date was capable of giving expression to the first five books of the Bible—it was this desire that prompted me to give some little attention to Sanskrit, so as to show that this objection, like many others, was founded in lack of knowledge. “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.”—Hos. 4:6. During the last fifty years the Church has suffered woefully from the lack of exegetical scholarship—old Hosea is up to date in this the twentieth century of our Christian era.

How appallingly true are the words of the apostle Paul: “This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord [note the emphasis], that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.”—Eph. 4:17-19. This is an inspired and accurate description of the mental and moral degradation of the ungodly. The great apostle Peter is more abrupt and even more forceful in his denunciation of those that go a-whoring (as the old prophets expressed it) after this brutalization of our divine race. Hear his stern rebuke in speaking of the sinners of his day: “But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they

understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption."—2 Peter 2:12.

During the last fifty years certain schools, seminaries, colleges and universities have been sorely afflicted with the plague of mental imbecility. Scientific processes and philosophical reasonings have been thrown to the winds, and the wildest speculations possible to the darkened mind of unregenerate man, have been propounded with the pompous parade of unmitigated ignorance to the irreparable injury of the student bodies of two continents. In this case the mental prostitution has been of the basest kind. The savage with his totem or his manito has a better idea than our godless evolutionists. The classical heathen in believing in Zeus and Athena, in Jupiter and Juno were vastly in advance of our blind materialists in the higher realms of thought—in advance of our mud philosophers with their lying "gospel of dirt." This modern materialism is a deadly plant which has two roots; namely, ignorance and impudence. These are the twin sisters of every diabolism that Satan has propagated in this wicked world.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron."—I Tim. 4:1, 2.

APOSTATE SCIENCE

The apostles of blessed renown,
Had a Judas of treacherous smile,
Who received from his Saviour no crown,
For his basest attempts to beguile.

Now this treacherous Science declares,
That the beasts are our deities great,
And that life is a doom of despairs,
Because darkness forever's our fate.

But vain Science is false to the truth,
And is false to the Maker of all.
It pollutes the sweet springs of our youth,
And denies the celestial call.

For the Word of the Lord has made known,
That 'mid Eden's creations so fair,
The Almighty established our home,
As the Scriptures so clearly declare.

GOD IS NOT UNKNOWABLE

How strangely perverse our modern evolutionist philosopher must be! He tells us that we are finite and that God is infinite, and that, consequently we are unable to apprehend the Supreme Being. He affirms that to us mortals God is "inscrutable" and "unknowable" and that the Creator, whoever He may be, is quite beyond the reach of our thought and imagination. Now, are these contentions reasonable?

Are not time and space two well-known infinities? Has any one ever found the boundaries of infinite space, or measured the distance from east to west in the sidereal heavens? Yet without any very deep thinking or lofty imagining we know a good deal about space. Even the most illiterate have clear and distinct ideas on the subject. Among the first things realized by the child-mind is space—it cries for its food when it is out of reach. We all early in life acquire what may be called a working knowledge of distances. Almost any child can talk intelligently about an inch, a foot, a yard, a mile. In a word, the needful knowledge of space is a universal possession of mankind.

The same may be said of time, or duration, which, being without beginning or end, is infinite—is indeed a dual infinity. Sometimes men speak of a past eternity and of a future eternity; but more properly speaking, however, eternity is duration without beginning and without end. Yet though a finite mind does not grasp the full significance of an infinite past and an infinite future, we have quite distinct and definite, correct and practical ideas of time. Even the lowest tribes of earth know the times and seasons that are measured out to them by the sun and moon. It may require fine astronomical instruments and accurate observations to measure a month or a year exactly; but we can know all about time that is in any way related to our well-being. The Creator has so bountifully endowed man with faculties that he easily acquires an adequate knowledge of duration—a knowledge which is fully sufficient for our complete happiness and the perfection of our nature in this mundane sphere. Therefore, we do not need to trouble ourselves about infinite duration or infinite space. Let them be matters for idle speculations, wherein the vain hypotheses

of evolution may be lost in the boundless spaces of a well-merited oblivion, like "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever."—Jude 13.

As we can know space and time to the full measure of our well-being, in like manner the Supreme Being has placed Himself well within the sphere of our ability to apprehend Him. He is neither "inscrutable" nor "unknowable." We can discern His handiwork which is visible everywhere. Men can read the history of vegetable and animal life; for it has been written by the Almighty Author on great stone leaves that are the enduring foundations of this planet. His book of nature spreads out its illustrated pages on land and sea and sky. Also, we can hear His voice in the singing of birds, the warbling of brooks, the sound of the wind, the roar of the myriad-tongued oceans, and the rolling of the thunders which are "the rustling of the robes of the Almighty." Then, on a clear, starry night, we can look up and listen with old Pythagoras to "the music of the spheres." Also, the blue ethereal sky with its lights and shadows, with its changing and blending hues, reveals the skill of the Infinite Artist. Again, when howling winds and raging waters, when lightnings flash and thunderbolts strike, when tidal waves inundate and earthquakes shake the mountain ranges, then let sinful mortals fear and tremble; for the Judge Eternal is going forth in the majesty of His Omnipotence. Verily, God is neither "inscrutable" nor "unknowable." His blessed ministries in Providence and grace and His glorious works in His boundless Universe proclaim to all created intelligences that the Christian's God is an Absolute and Eternal Personality infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness. This all-glorious Being, our Heavenly Father, reveals Himself to mortals, and has lavished upon us His gracious attention and infinite love.

What wonderful Providences were vouchsafed to His ancient people! The Ten Plagues in Egypt made Pharaoh willing to let Israel go, the dividing of the Red Sea saved His chosen race and destroyed the military strength of their enemies, and the manna given for forty years in the wilderness is an overwhelming answer to all infidels. The storm that destroyed the Spanish Armada in the time of Queen

Elizabeth, and the "Protestant Wind" from the East that speedily brought the fleet of William, Prince of Orange, to the shores of England, and at the same time shut King James' fleet in the mouth of the Thames, thus preventing a naval battle, were interventions of kind Heaven. These blessed Providences peacefully placed a Protestant king on the throne of the British Empire. Truly, Washington and Lincoln were most certainly providential gifts to this great Republic in hours of extreme peril. Both sacred and secular history afford numberless proofs of minute and gracious interpositions of a loving Heavenly Father. He that cares for "the fowls of the air" and "the lilies of the field," and gives each blade of grass its drop of dew—does He not remember man whom He has created in His own "image" and "after" His own "likeness"?

In the unspeakable Gift of His only-begotten Son, the Eternal Father has marvelously manifested His infinite goodness and love and His supreme sense of absolute justice and righteousness. Since "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19), our adorable Saviour is the most glorious Revelation of Deity possible for God to give and for man to receive. In our Blessed Lord the loving Heart and the infinite Mind of our Heavenly Father are wonderfully united and manifested to the human family. In a most gracious manner the just, holy, and loving character of the Supreme Being and His glorious attributes are fully revealed by Christ to all created intelligences in the universe.

But even further does our Heavenly Father go in making Himself known to mortals. He has sent even His Holy Spirit to give us a "spiritual understanding," and to illuminate even the sacred page of His Holy Word—to unseal the Holy Scriptures for us. Thus we are enlightened so that we can distinguish truth from error, and can know the difference between a book inspired by the Spirit and a book inspired by Satan. Moreover, this Third Person of the Holy Trinity convicts and regenerates sinners, and makes them the children of God, and sanctifies believers, and makes them happy and useful in this life and prepares them for the more glorious life to come.

And, further, the Good Lord has given us His inspired Word, to be the man of our counsel. The Psalmist said: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path."—Ps. 119:105. The Bible is the Christian's manual. Some incompetent and self-appointed critics have said vague and foolish things about inspiration, because they have not the "understanding heart." Of course, the Almighty is able to speak both to and through a human being, and inspiration is nothing more nor less than that. The Holy Spirit so used the apostles and prophets that their words and thoughts and writings were exactly what the Lord intended they should be. In each case the Spirit so moved upon the heart and mind of the speaker or writer that every "jot and tittle" was absolutely as God desired. Sometimes it was verbal inspiration, as in the case of prophecy, when superhuman wisdom and knowledge were required, while, at other times, human ability was used as far as it accurately served the Lord's purpose. But always the original manuscripts were the *infallible* "Word of God." Paul, in speaking on this subject, affirms: "Ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—I Thes. 2:13. In passing, it may be said that the only work of the scholar is to get as near the original manuscripts as possible, and then to give in each case the best possible translation.

How absolutely foolish for evolutionists to state that our Heavenly Father is "inscrutable" and "unknowable" to us, His children! These benighted modern philosophers do not see God in nature or in Revelation, because they do not know Him and do not want to see their Blessed Lord. It is a sad and awful truth that "the carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God." None so blind as those that will not see. But what say the Holy Scriptures about this "inscrutable" and "unknowable" heresy?

Jno. 7:17: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Here the implication is evident that the doctrines of God are *knowable*.

Jno. 8:28: "Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath

taught me, I speak these things." Since His Father taught Him and He taught His disciples, surely they had knowledge of the Father.

Jno. 8:32: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The truth here means the Gospel Revelation of God, and a knowledge of it is man's inheritance, according to the Divine will, and that knowledge makes men free from sin and death and hell.

Jno. 10:14: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine." His followers know their Saviour; but He was with God and was God, therefore His followers in knowing Christ, know God.

Jno. 10:38: "That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me . . . and I in Him." It was the intention, in the original plan of salvation, that we should *know* the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Christians must know the Spirit, for our bodies are His temples.

Jno. 13:7: "Jesus answered and said unto Him [Peter], What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." On the Day of Pentecost and during his great ministry, Peter learned many things about the Holy Trinity.

Jno. 14:7: "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him." This is a most explicit statement proving that Christians do most certainly know their Heavenly Father.

Jno. 14:20: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." Is not this a marvelous revelation? Christ in God, and we in Christ. If we dwell in Christ, we must know Him. Oh! the wickedness of men who speak of God as the "inscrutable" and "unknowable."

Jno. 17:3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." The great purpose of God in redemption was that men might know God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, and all true Christians do know their Heavenly Father.

Jno. 17:7: "Now they have known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given me are of Thee." The disciples knew that all power and judgment had been given to their Blessed

Lord. Even the mysteries of the Kingdom were revealed to them.

I Jno. 2:3: "And hereby we do know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments." How unmistakable is this passage! If we keep His commandments "we do *know* that we *know* Him."

I Jno. 4:12, 13: "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us because He hath given us of His Spirit." If we *dwell in God* and *He dwells in us*, most assuredly He is *knowable* and a known Personality.

The above twelve passages have been taken from the Gospel by John and his first Epistle. To quote all the New Testament passages on this subject would fill many pages. The blessed doctrine that the Christian knows his Heavenly Father, his loving Saviour, and his Comforter the Holy Spirit, is abundantly proved by numberless passages of Holy Writ, and by the happy experience of millions upon millions of Christians in all lands and in all ages of the world. How absurd, then, is the idea that God is beyond the reach of human thought and imagination: "For," as Paul declared to the learned Athenians, "in Him we live, and move, and have our being."—Acts 17:28. Be it remembered that the doctrine of assurance, that is the witness of the Spirit in the believer's heart, was one of the most prominent doctrines of early Methodism. Mr. Wesley laid great stress upon the doctrine which is this: The Christian knows that he loves his Blessed Lord and that his Lord loves him. Among his standard sermons, there are two on "The Witness of the Spirit" and from the text: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."—Rom. 8:16. The true believer enjoys the assurance of faith.

"Then, only then we feel
Our interest in his blood,
And cry with joy unspeakable,
Thou art my Lord, my God!"

ASTRONOMY

About 2,000 years B. C., the Chinese determined equinoxes and solstices. "This is known from the orders promulgated by the emperor about 2300 B. C., as recorded in the Shu

Chung, a collection of documents antique in the time of Confucius (550-478 B. C.). And Yeo was merely the renovator of a system long previously established. The Shu Chung further relates the tragic fate of the official astronomers Hsi and Ho, put to death for neglecting to perform the rites customary during an eclipse of the sun, identified by Professor S. E. Russell with a partial observation visible in northern China 2136 B. C. . . . There is, however, no certainty that the Chinese were then capable of predicting eclipses."

"Astrology was, in Egypt, the prelude to astronomy. The stars were observed that they might be duly worshipped."

With the Babylonians the case was different. . . . From them the Greeks derived their first notions of astronomy." But "there is no getting back to the beginning of astronomy by the shores of the Euphrates. Records dating from the reign of Sargon of Akkad (3800 B. C.) imply that even then the varying aspects of the sky had been long under expert observation." No doubt, those long-lived antediluvians acquired a great knowledge of the heavens.

"A steady flow of knowledge from East to West began in the 7th century, B. C. A Babylonian sage named Berossus founded a school 640 B. C., in the island of Cos, and perhaps counted Thales of Miletus (c. 639-548) among his pupils. . . . Pythagoras of Samos (fl. 540-510 B. C.) learned on his travels in Egypt and the East to identify the morning and evening stars, to recognize the obliquity of the ecliptic, and to regard the earth as a sphere freely poised in space."—En. Br., V. 1, pp. 808-9. In all ages and nations the thoughts of men have ever been divinely moved to contemplate the realms celestial. For "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork."—Ps. 19:1.

But long centuries before this, that ancient patriarch of Uz had said: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing."—Job. 26:7. This truly scientific declaration of the wise and patient, "perfect and upright" servant of God, was made probably a thousand years before Berosus founded his school at Cos, or Pythagoras of Samos taught that the earth was a "sphere" "freely poised in space." As Pythagoras was a traveler in Egypt

and the East, it is quite probable that he visited Jerusalem and learned from Jewish priests and scribes their correct ideas about our solar system. For it must be remembered that the Jewish nation was Jehovah's missionary to the other nations of antiquity.

Some quotations from "Astronomy for Busy People," by H. Periam Hawkins:

In speaking of the Milky Way he says: "Its full extent at present cannot be known with certainty; but it is now stated that light would take at least two hundred thousand years to cross its diameter, and that it is nowhere nearer than two hundred million times the sun's distance."—p. 3. That is, $93,000,000 \times 200,000,000$ which equals 18,600,000,000,000,000 which is 18 quadrillions and 600 trillions of miles.

Our Solar System has "a diameter of about 5,580,000,000 miles, which would take a cannon ball 500 years to cross from side to side, traveling at the rate of about 2,000 miles an hour." Our System "is set by itself, at an immense distance from all other stars. A mighty space of about 5,000 times the above diameter must be traversed in all directions before another sun is reached."—p. 8. That makes the distance to the nearest sun 27,900,000,000,000 miles.

Astronomers can tell the direction in which our Solar System is going. Photographs are taken of the heavens and in a few years another set of photographs are taken. Now, in one direction it will be evident that the stars are drifting apart, but in the opposite direction they will be getting closer together, while on the sides there will be little or no change. Thus the spacing indicates the direction in which our System is moving. At present our earth and sun are traveling through space at the rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles a second, and in the direction of the star Vega in the constellation Lyra. "This is a wondrous sight, and mocks all human grandeur."

Further, the solar spectrum reveals the fact that in the sun and stars there are in nearly every case the same elements as compose our earth; such as calcium, cobalt, copper, hydrogen, iron, nickel, platinum, silver, sodium, etc. See General Astronomy by Young, p. 198.

It has been discovered that our sun "is a great magnet." "Hence we may reasonably infer that every star, and prob-

ably every planet, is also a magnet, as the earth has been known to be since the days of Gilbert's 'De Magnete.'"—Hall, p. 70.

Alpha Centauri, which is the third brightest star in the heavens and which is our nearest stellar neighbor, is distant about 25,000,000,000,000 miles.—En. Br., Vol. 25, p. 789. This is a little less than the previous estimate.

Consequently these vast suns though thousands of times larger than our sun, are so far away that to the most powerful telescopes they always present only a point of light—never a disc.

THE LIGHT-GIVING POWER OF STARS

Some stars give 10 times the light of our sun.

Some stars give 100 times the light of our sun.

Some stars give 1,000 times the light of our sun.

Some stars give 10,000 times the light of our sun.

Some stars give 100,000 times the light of our sun.

—See En. Br., Vol. 25, p. 793.

"Light is God's shadow."—Plato.

LIGHT

"The white light of the sun, which contains all the different colors as discovered by Sir Isaac Newton, is made up of a variety of rays having a vast number of wave lengths which vibrate more or less quickly, according to the length of the waves. Each wave has its own special tint or shade of color, which also corresponds with the number of vibrations, as well as upon the length wave, so that the sun's light enters our eyes at the varying rate of about 400 to 800 billion vibrations a second, the rays at the end of the spectrum, the red waves, undulating more slowly than the waves at the violet end."—Astronomy for Busy People, by H. Periam Hawkins, p. 103.

The following are the eight planets in our System, namely: Mercury, Venus, Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune.

The earth is nearly 8,000 miles in diameter, and in its circuit around the sun goes about 1,000 miles a minute, and makes the journey every year of 576,600,000 miles.—Hawkins, p. 23.

The Moon is about 240,000 miles from the Earth and its diameter is 2,160 miles.

Mars, the red planet, was called the god of war. It is a near neighbor, and has a diameter of 4,200 miles. Some have imagined that in the future we might have communication with its inhabitants—if it has inhabitants.

Jupiter's diameter is 86,000 miles. It is still glowing with incandescent light and heat, and is the largest planet in our Solar System.

Saturn's diameter is 73,000 miles. It is encircled with rings, the exterior diameter of the outer ring being 168,000 miles.

Uranus was discovered by Sir William Herschel in 1781. Its diameter is 32,000 miles.

Neptune is the most distant planet of our System. Its discovery "is justly reckoned as the greatest triumph of mathematical astronomy. Uranus (its next nearest planet) failed to move precisely in the path which the computers predicted for it, and was misguided by some unknown influence to an extent which a keen eye might almost see without telescopic aid. The difference between its observed place and that prescribed for it, had become in 1845 nearly as much as the 'intolerable' quantity of 2' of an arc." "But just these minute discrepancies constituted the data which were found sufficient for calculating the position of a hitherto unknown planet and bringing it to light."—General Astronomy by Young, p. 369. Thus as Uranus approached a certain point in the heavens its speed was accelerated and as it passed that point it was retarded. This was noted and a telescope was directed to that part of the heavens, and—*Neptune was discovered*.

Quotations from "The New Heavens," by George Ellery Hale follow: "In a survey of the entire heavens from pole to pole, it would not be possible to detect more than from six to seven thousand stars with the naked eye."—p. 1.

He further says with regard to the great nebula in Orion: "Globular star clusters, containing tens of thousands of stars, are on so great a scale (according to Shapley) that light, traveling at the rate of 186,000 miles per second, may take 500 years to cross one of them, while the most distant of

these objects may be more than 200,000 light-years from the earth. The spiral nebulae, more than a million in number, are vast whirling masses."—p. 12. Now a light-year equals $63,000 \times 93,000,000$; that is, the distance of our earth from the sun, multiplied by 63,000, and the product is 1,171,800,000,000,000,000, which is over one quintillion miles.

"If the sun were hollow with the earth at its center, the moon, though 240,000 miles from us, would have room and to spare in which to describe its orbit around the earth; for the sun is 865,000 miles in diameter, so that its volume is more than a million times that of the earth."—p. 36.

The diameter of Betelgeuse is 215,000,000 miles. Therefore, if our sun were in its center, our earth and moon could revolve round the sun and never swing outside of the spacious Betelgeuse.—p. 49.

Arcturus, the beautiful standard first magnitude star, that follows the tail of Ursa Major, has a diameter of 21,000,000 miles which is more than twenty times greater than the diameter of our sun.

Antares which is in the great constellation Scorpio and which is red, like Mars, according to Hale, p. 57, has a diameter of 400,000,000 miles. Of course these immense suns are composed mostly of rare gases.

Quotations from George Ellery Hale's, "The Depths of the Universe:—"

In speaking of 61 Cygni, he says: "Its displacement, when observed from opposite ends of the earth's orbit, is four-tenths of a second of an arc—the diameter of a one-inch ball at the distance of eight miles. This means that 61 Cygni is about 40,000,000,000,000 miles from the earth, and affords a fine glimpse of the enormous scale of the universe. For this is one of the nearest of the stars."—p. 15.

"Neptune, at the outermost limit of our solar system, is 2,800,000,000 miles from the sun."—pp. 15 and 16.

During what is called a light-year, light goes 6,000,000,000,000 miles, which equal 1,000,000 times 6,000,000 miles.

"Serius is 26 times as bright as our sun."—p. 16.

"Over the whole sky the 60-inch (reflector) would probably record more than 1,000,000,000 stars, while the 100-inch should add fully 500,000,000 more."

"The light that left (the Hercules cluster) 36,000 years ago, traveling at the rate of nearly six million million miles a year, has only just reached us."—p. 33.

The astronomer with his marvelous instruments is reaching out towards the illimitable boundaries, and up towards the infinite altitudes, and down towards the fathomless abysses of infinite space. In this infinitely spacious Universe, our Solar System, which has been the glory of mankind, seems to sink into insignificance. Verily, man is surrounded by wonders and mysteries, and glories and vistas that sweep out into the limitless unknown, and utterly transcend our powers of thought and imagination.

"In a certain sense we may say that the Universe now presents itself to the thinking astronomer, not as a heterogeneous collection of bodies, but as a unified whole."—En. Br., Vol. I, p. 801. Mark—a *unified whole*. *Evolution could never unify a Universe.*

Really, this modern evolution craze is the monumental proof of mental depravity. Of the Christian Evolutionist and of the Christian Scientist, it may truly be said: *Non sanum esse.*

What a lack of good sense and reverence and knowledge of the divine mysteries some weak-minded Christians manifest when they vainly attempt to explain away the blessed miracles of the Holy Scriptures! He that stationed in Ursa Major the Pointers to show the North Pole Star that it might guide seekers of liberty to northern latitudes of freedom—can He not liberate the bodies and souls of men from the powers of evil and raise the dead? He that laid the foundations for the Universe and made a bed for the fathomless oceans—can He not divide the waters of the Red Sea and hold back the floods of Jordan and liberate a nation in a night? He that created that most brilliant constellation, Orion, and girded him with the three kings, and adorned him with such shining stars as Betelgeuse, Bellatrix and Regal, and his famous nebula, and placed him in the midst of the spacious firmament to give splendor to the Universe—can He not make the sun to stand still that Joshua may conquer a land for truth and righteousness? He that cast a mantle of surpassing celestial brilliancy on shining Sirius

—can He not heal a sick king, Hezekiah, honor His faithful prophet Isaiah, and teach the Baal worshippers, the sun-worshipping Babylonian astronomers, that the God of the Hebrews is the only true and living God of earth and heaven, and the Creator of sun, moon and stars? Oh! may the Christian Church which so long has been annoyed by the silly cavilings of base-minded materialism and which has been too blind to discern the marvelous manifestations of infinite power, wisdom and love in behalf of human redemption—may the Holy Spirit-baptized Church in blessed triumph, “Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.”—Is. 60:1.

In the presence of this illimitable and illuminated universe, our little planet is but a grain of sand—but a particle of dust upon the balances of the Eternal God.

Wonderful words fell from the lips of that ancient patriarch Job:

“He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds.”

“The pillars of heaven tremble and are astonished at his reproof.”

“He divideth the sea with His power.”

“By His spirit He hath garnished the heavens.”

“He stretched out the north over the empty place.”

“And hangeth the earth upon nothing.”

“Lo, these are parts of His ways.”

“But how little a portion is heard of Him?”

“But the thunder of His power who can understand?”—Job 26:7, 8, 11-14.

All His works are gloriously perfect, and

“Every prospect pleases
And only man is vile.”

Well might the Psalmist exclaim:

“When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained;

What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?—Ps. 8:3, 4.

Job, the ancient patriarch, beheld the glory of the heavens and instructs his brother man concerning the Almighty Creator:

"Who shaketh the earth out of her place, and causeth the pillars thereof to tremble.

"Who commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; and sealeth up the stars.

"Who alone spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea.

"Who maketh Arcturus, Orion and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south.

"Who doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number."—Job 9:6-10.

The Lord asked these questions of His faithful servant Job: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding."

"Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest, or who hath stretched the line upon it?"

"Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof;"

"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"—Job 38:4-7.

If the great patriarch of antiquity could not answer these questions, how much less can our modern pretentious and presumptuous critics explain the hidden mysteries of chaos and cosmos and the deeper mysteries of plant, and animal, and human life?

Further, this ancient sage asks our modern agnostics:

"Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?"

"Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth [the 12 constellations of the Zodiac] in his season, or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?"

"Worlds on worlds are rolling ever,

From creation to decay,

Like the bubbles on a river

Sparkling, bursting, blown away."—*Shelley*.

In our world there is nothing great but *man*, and in the vast Universe there is nothing great but *God*.

The evangelical prophet thought that the Almighty could easily manipulate our little speck of a planet; for he said: "Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down."—Isa. 24:1.

EFFECTS OF EVOLUTION ON SCIENTISTS
THEMSELVES

DARWIN

"The example of the great apostle of evolution himself should warn us as to this"—[its evil influence]. "As he [Darwin] appears in his recent biography, we see the same man paralyzed by a spiritual atrophy, blinded and shut up in his prison and chained to the mill of a materialistic philosophy." "This depth of unscientific and unspiritual degeneration into which the mind may be thrown by the excessive pursuit of evolutionary ideas, is well shown by Darwin himself in a letter written a year before his death. With reference to his doubts as to the existence of God, he asks, 'Can one trust to the convictions of a monkey's mind?'" "This seems a serious indictment against evolution, at least in its extreme forms; but its validity seems to be proved by a careful scrutiny of the developments that have followed the publication of the *Origin of Species*, and which, despite the efforts of so-called theistic and Christian evolutionists, may be held to have tended constantly to a lower and lower depth of materialistic agnosticism, and, at the same time, of debasement of natural science into a jumble of false classifications and visionary speculations." "It is no doubt true that monistic and agnostic evolution, and those forms of Darwinism which follow the author of the system in negation of the living God, are inconsistent with religion as well as with all the higher interests of men." Dawson further says: "That of the agnostic evolution and the acceptance of German criticism in disintegrating the earlier books of the Bible, are at the moment combining their forces in the attack on Evangelical Christianity."—pp. 14-16, 23, *Modern Ideas of Evolution*, by Dawson.

GEORGE Q. ROMANES

His father was a Christian minister and a professor of Greek in the University of Kingston, Canada; but the son was educated in England. He early formed an intimate friendship with Charles Darwin, whose theories he did much during his early life to popularize and support. But there

came a change in his mental attitude towards evolution—and during that transition from materialism to Christianity, there was a fine correspondence between Romanes and Rev. S. L. Guilik, M. A., who was a noted missionary to Japan. According to the En. Br., “in 1882 Romanes published an article on the ‘Fallacy of Materialism,’ and in his Rede lecture of 1885 he appeared as a monist. Subsequently his views again changed in the direction of orthodoxy, as is shown by his *Thoughts on Religion* written shortly before his death and published in 1895. Truly, there is absolutely nothing in this animalization theory to stay the soul of man in the great crisis of human existence. It should be remembered to the credit of Professor Romanes that he publicly renounced evolution and accepted Christianity.

HERBERT SPENCER

He zealously tried to give materialism a philosophical setting. It is not likely that his Synthetic Philosophy will be long-lived. No one can write a sane philosophy while the Almighty Creator is relegated to the realm of the *Unknownable*; for the age-long search of the human heart, especially in its moments of toil and trouble, is after the living God.

In his “Collapse of Evolution,” Professor L. T. Townsend tells the following anecdote concerning Spencer:

“In a book by Henry Murray, brother of David Christie Murray, the English publisher, this is told of Herbert Spencer:

“Walking up and down the lawn of Buchanan’s house in Mansfield Gardens, I told him in a momentary absence of his host, what a load of personal obligation I felt under to the First Principles, and added that I intended to devote the reading hours of the next two or three years to a thorough study of his entire output. “What have you read of mine?” he asked. I told him. . . . “Then,” said Spencer (and it was the only time I ever heard such counsel from the lips of any writer regarding his own works), “I should say that you have read quite enough.” He fell silent for a moment, and then added, “I have passed my life in beating the air.” —p. 63. How unlike the triumphant exclamation of the great apostle to the Gentiles! “I therefore so run, not as un-

certainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air.”—I Cor. 9:26. Here is sounded a clear note of certitude and unshaken confidence in the final triumphant result of a Christian faith. But soulless materialism just leads lost and weary mortals towards “the blackness of darkness forever.”

HAECKEL

He believed that “just as the highest animals have been evolved from the simplest forms of life, so the highest faculties of the human mind have been evolved from the soul of the brute-beasts, and more remotely from the simple cell-soul of the unicellular Protozoa. As a consequence of these views Haeckel was led to deny the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will and the existence of a Personal God.”—En. Br., p. 804.

“Shortly before his retirement there was a startling exposure made of some of the methods by which he tried to bolster up science against Christianity. Over his own signature he was compelled by other scientists to admit the existence of deliberate forgeries in his scientific writings. He had taken drawings of other biologists and altered them, taking away fifteen or sixteen vertebrae from one monkey embryo and changing the name. He also altered a human embryo so as to contain eleven vertebrae not occurring in the original,—thus, if possible, to bridge the chasm of the never-to-be-found ‘missing link,’ and to bring monkeykind and mankind together and thus disprove ‘the word of God.’

“We have before us an extract from his own confession that appeared last January in the Munchner Allgemeine Zeitung, in which he says:

“‘To put an end to this unsavory dispute, I begin at once with the contrite confession, that a small per cent (six or eight per cent) of my embryo-diagrams are really forgeries . . . those namely for which the observed material is so incomplete or insufficient as to compel us . . . to fill in and reconstruct the missing links by hypothesis and comparative synthesis . . . I should feel utterly condemned and annihilated by the admission, were it not that hundreds of the best observers and most reputable biologists lie under the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, ana-

tomical, histological and embryological diagrams . . . are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored, schematized and reconstructed.'

"There has been much excitement in German scientific circles over Haeckel's downfall, and his repudiation 'is now unanimous and complete.'"—The Bible Student and Teacher, March, 1910.

But on the last page of the "Collapse of Evolution" by Professor Townsend, is given what might be called the wail of this aggressive and unprincipled atheist.

"Professor Haeckel, near the close of his life, bewailing the fact that he was standing almost alone among German scientists as an advocate of evolution, affords another example of the misgivings of anti-Christian scientists when nearing the summons before the Eternal Tribunal.

"During the Torrey-Alexander meetings in Philadelphia, Dr. Kuhn, the celebrated explorer and missionary, who before his conversion was a confirmed atheist and a favorite pupil of Professor Haeckel, made this statement as to his former teacher: 'About a year ago on my return from Africa I visited Dr. Haeckel at the University of Jena. In the course of conversation I ventured to ask him whether the position he had taken in the "Riddle of the Universe" was still his conviction. He paused a moment and then said, "I realize that there are weak spots in my argument which will be known to the world in later days." "Do you really know there is no God?" I then asked. "Of course I do not. I was an atheist once—I am such no longer."'" Thus at the last one after another, these vociferous and audacious propagators of this contemptible evolution fall down like Dagon, the heathen god of the Philistines, before the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord God of hosts. How true it is that Materialism provides a poor defense against the King of Terrors! And how true it is that the natural result of heresy in both Science and Religion is falsehood; for false ideas and false works are natural allies.

NIETZSCHE

This German pessimist and atheistic monstrosity gave his nation a "pagan brute philosophy." His "first principle of

humanity" was that "the weak and botched" should "perish." "If what we publish be true," he wrote to a feeble woman, "a feeble woman like you would have no right to exist." He said again: "Christianity is the greatest of all conceivable corruptions, the one immortal blemish of mankind." And he hated it because of its sympathy with the weak and botched. He glorified his ideal German "blonde beast" and gave the world a "superman," one-third brute, one-third devil, and one-third philosopher.

"Under the spell of his daring brutality, Germany adopted the motto, 'Corsica has conquered Galilee.'

"Nietzsche's philosophy of beastliness has its roots in the evolutionary assumption that the strong and fit, in the struggle for existence, have the scientific right to destroy the weak and unfit. . . . He has discarded the decalogue, thrown away the Bible and recognizes no law of God. To him, whatever is scientific, according to this evolutionary teaching, is right."—The Bible Champion, Jan., 1923. This wicked man repented not of his blasphemies, but being possessed with an evil spirit was driven into insanity, and in 1888 "was pronounced hopelessly insane."

At the last concerning this abominable evolution, it is either renunciation or destruction. It makes men irrational degenerates. It is the enemy of Christianity and the patron of all forms of wickedness and heresy. It demoralizes the heart and dethrones reason. Consequently, all teachers and professors who prostitute their divine calling "giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (I Tim. 4:1) are bad citizens, are enemies to all the higher interests of the human family. On account of this the trustees of all institutions of learning should lay to heart their solemn responsibility to Almighty God and the rising generation, and drive Darwin's unclean apes and monkeys not only out of the churches, but also out of the schools.

DARWIN

Most of the following quotations are taken from "Collapse of Evolution," by Professor L. T. Townsend:

"In early life Darwin was a believer in the Bible as the Word of God, and he believed that God answered prayer.

In his later life he confesses with regret that he had lost all taste for poetry, music, painting and religion."

"Lady Hope, a consecrated English woman, speaking before a Northfield audience, August 15, 1915, on Darwin's religious life, gave the following account of a personal interview that subsequently was published in *The Watchman Examiner*. The article as published was written in her own hand, and this is what she says" in part:

"On an autumn afternoon, I was asked to go in and sit with the well-known professor, Charles Darwin. He was almost bedridden some months before he died. . . . He was sitting up in bed. . . . propped up by pillows . . . In his hand he held an open Bible, which he was always studying.

" "What are you reading now?" I asked, as I seated myself by his bedside.

" "Hebrews!" he answered. "The Royal Book, I call it. Isn't it grand?" Then placing his finger on certain passages, he commented on them.

" "I made some allusion to the strong opinions expressed by many persons on the history of the creation, its grandeur, and then their treatment of the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis.

" "He seemed greatly distressed, his fingers twitched nervously, and a look of agony came over his face, as he said: "I was a young man with unformed ideas. I threw out queries, suggestions, wondering all the time over everything; and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire. People made a religion of them."

" "Then he paused, and after a few more sentences on "the holiness of God" and "the grandeur of this Book," looking at the Bible which he was holding tenderly all the time, he said: "I have a summer house in the garden which holds about thirty people. It is over there," pointing through the open window. "I want you, very much, to speak there. I know you read the Bible in the villages. Tomorrow afternoon I should like the servants on the place, some tenants, and a few of the neighbors to gather there. Will you speak to them?"

“ “What shall I speak about?” I asked.

“ “Christ Jesus!” he replied, in a clear, emphatic voice, adding in a lower tone, “and His salvation. Is not that the best theme? And then I want you to sing some hymns with them. You lead on your small instrument, do you not?”

“The wonderful look of brightness and animation on his face as he said this I shall never forget, and he added: “If you take the meeting at 3 o’clock this window will be open, and you will know that I am joining in the singing.”’”

When the solemn realities of eternity stare a man in the face, he needs and wants something infinitely more than this imaginary evolution to comfort his heart and steady his mind. But Darwin should have had more honesty, and should have published to the world that his fallacious theories were only a sandy foundation for a sinner in the hour and article of death. It has been asserted that once when a Christian friend asked Mr. Darwin to consider the claims of religion, he answered: “In my early life I was exercised about such matters; but in the passing of the years, my powers of spiritual apprehension were so atrophied that now there is no response from within me.”—Bible Champion, May, 1924. That must have been before this interview with Mrs. Hope.

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE

At the beginning of this materialistic rage, Professor Wallace was regarded as the peer of Darwin; but as time went on he saw the fallaciousness of the reasoning and the unscientific nature of evolution. Here is what he said on a certain occasion:

“Neither the probability of such an origin nor even its possibility has been supported by anything which can be termed scientific facts or logical reasoning.” He also affirmed his belief in creation and in a divine purpose in it. He said: “I believe there is a purpose in creation. It meets me everywhere I turn. I cannot examine the smallest or the commonest living thing without finding my reason uplifted and amazed by the miracle, by the beauty, by the power and the wisdom of its creation.”

“Following up the same thought, he declared that ‘materialism is the most gigantic ‘foolishness’ and that ‘nothing

in evolution can account for the soul of man'; and that the difference between man and the other animals is unbridgeable.'"—Ibid., August, 1919.

It should also be remembered that Wallace was a traveler and naturalist. "He spent four years on the Amazon . . . and eight years among the Malay Islands, making extensive zoological collections."—Ch. En.

"In many of his subsequent publications, Wallace differs from Darwin on certain points. Thus the two concluding essays contend that man has not, like the other animals, been produced by the unaided operation of natural selection, but that other forces have also been in operation." . . . "More recently he expressed his dissatisfaction with the hypothesis of 'sexual selection' by which Darwin sought to explain the conspicuous characters which are 'sometimes displayed by animals.'" Wallace was an extensive traveler, prolific writer and a great naturalist, and in his later years found it was impossible to follow Darwin.

Thus we see that at the last not only Darwin himself, but nearly all his co-adjectors such as Spencer, Wallace, Romanes and even Haeckel awake from their intellectual stupor and realize that evolution is just a *huge humbug*. And now, since the scientists have renounced this loathsome and most notorious delusion of the last half century, it may be expected that weak-minded professors of certain seminaries and *schools of religion* (they are not *Christian* schools), will blindly go on leading the blind into the deep and dark ditches of doubts and heresies. But Christian professors of real Christian Schools of Theology will go forward with ever-increasing intellectual clearness and power teaching "the truth as it is in Jesus," explaining the eternal verities of our Holy Christianity, and giving the Churches an able and educated, a blessed and powerful ministry of strong and courageous preachers who will "*earnestly contend* for the faith that was once delivered unto the saints."—Jude 3.

THE DEBASING INFLUENCES OF EVOLUTION

President R. A. Montgomery, D.D., LL.D., Fairfield, Iowa, speaking on this subject, says: "The egoism and self-confidence of many . . . is thereby greatly accentuated.

If all existing phenomena are to find their proper explanation in the continuity and interaction of their physical antecedents, spiritual values may be thrown out of focus by such assumptions. And this is what has happened for multitudes of men."

He continues by saying: "There also occurred a change of attitude toward the institutions of organized society—the home, the school, the Church, and the state felt the impact of new motives for their appraisal or depreciation. Whereas, in 1870 there was scarcely a state in the Union in which the Bible was not read in the public schools, now there are twenty-odd states in which it is a violation of state laws to read the Bible in the public schools."

"The effect on the religious life, its institutions, and literature, is known to us all . . . Religion has lost its note of authority and we have fallen into something like an hysteria of effort to adjust ourselves to the new thought and the new day. In many places the Church has taken on tendencies that lead to the disparagement of statements of faith, and too frequently faith in the supernatural is ignored, if not despised."

The above appeared in a certain number of Bible Champion, and the following in that of May, 1924.

It appears that an anxious mother called attention to a text-book entitled, "Ancient Man," which was said to be "a wonderfully delightful History in Story for Boys and Girls, and which is being used in some of the very 'select schools,' of our cities. This so-called History begins in this pleasant way: 'The great-great-grandfather of the human race was a very ugly and unattractive mammal. His head and most of his body were covered with long hair. His forehead was low and his jaw was like that of a wild animal. He lived in the damp blackness of vast forests. Altogether he was a miserable creature; in many respects far less attractive than a well-bred house dog. Of the earlier history of this man, we know nothing. We keep track of him through his bones and they tell us that he lived more than two thousand centuries ago. The rest is darkness.'"—B. Ch., May 24, p. 241. The above *abominable stuff* is surely

pleasant (?) reading for the fine children that are brought up in the happy homes of Christian America!

IMMANUEL KANT

He was born at Königsburg in Prussia in 1724, and died in 1804. Kant was probably "the greatest of all modern philosophers." "The tradition is that he was of Scottish descent, and that the name was originally spelled Cant." "His parents were of humble life, but pious, respectable, good people." "For nearly fifty years . . . Kant was a teacher of philosophy at Königsburg—a very general one, for he had to embrace in his lectures mathematics, physics, logic, metaphysics, natural theology, anthropology, physical geography, and more still, *Philosophical Encyclopaedia*, to say nothing of pyrotechnics and the art of fortification!" He was a small, thin, somewhat rickety, bundle of bones, scarcely five feet high . . . honest, truth speaking, perfectly well conducted." "No purer, no more living morality, has ever been professionally produced by philosopher than glows in the *Ethics* of Kant."—Ch. En. He was a teacher of extensive erudition, and as a great thinker will always rank among the immortals.

Also Kant's Practical Reason is full of theistic testimony. According to him, "Space and time are original intuitions of reason prior to all experience: this is the immortal discovery of Kant, and one of the fundamental teachings of critical philosophy."—Weber, p. 441.

In 1781, he published his Critique of Pure Reason, in which, apparently, he lost his way in discussing necessity. But in his Critique of Practical Reason he shows his love for and loyalty to the great theistic contentions. Also clearly does he commit himself to the moral law by his categorical imperative, "which may be stated thus: *Act in conformity with that maxim, and that maxim only, which you can at the same time will to be a universal law.*" In further discussion of this subject, he says: "The laws of the intelligible world I must therefore regard as imperatives, and the actions conformable to this principle as duties." Again, he says: "The categorical *ought* is thus an *apriori* synthetic *proposition.*"—Selections from Kant by Watson, pp. 241 and 255. Thus

this great philosopher recognized man's moral nature—recognized that vicegerent of God in the soul of man—that inward monitor which intuitively and instantly asserts *the ought* and *the ought not*. Of course agnosticism with its blind materialism is utterly ignorant of man's moral nature, and consequently ignores conscience. But "conscience is a revelation of the Supreme God in man."—Tulloch.

KANT'S POSTULATES OF PURE PRACTICAL REASON

"These postulates are *immortality*, *freedom* (in the positive sense, as casuality of a being who belongs to the intelligible world), and the *existence of God*. The *first* rests upon the practically necessary condition, that existence should continue long enough to permit of the complete realization of the moral law. The *second* arises from the necessary presupposition of man's independence of the world of sense, and his capability of determining his will in conformity with the law of an intelligible world, that is, the law of freedom. The *third* depends upon the necessity of presupposing a supreme, self-existent good, that is, the existence of God, as the condition under which the highest good may be realized in such an intelligible world." . . . "Lastly, practical reason brings us to the conception of a Supreme Being."—Watson, *Selections from Kant*, pp. 298-9.

Kant makes this fine statement: "No human intelligence can ever understand how immortality and the existence of God are possible; but, on the other hand, no sophistry will ever destroy the faith of even the most unreflective in their reality."—*Ibid.*, p. 300.

Kant, in speaking of "Faith as a Need of Pure Reason," says: "The possibility of this highest good has therefore to be presupposed, as well as the conditions without which it would not be possible, namely, God, freedom, and immortality."—*Ibid.*, p. 302.

In the *Critique of Judgment*, he says: "Philosophy has thus two main divisions, theoretical philosophy or the *philosophy of nature*, and practical or *moral philosophy*."—*Ibid.*, p. 307.

Here is another of his fine statements: "In all its manifold variety *nature is purposive*. That is to say, nature is con-

ceived as if the unity of its manifold empirical laws were due to an intelligence." Again, hear this: "*The Principle that the Form of Nature implies Purpose, is a Transcendental Principle of Judgment.*"—Ibid., p. 313. How wonderfully and beautifully he lifts us up into transcendental realms of speculation and thought.

"Kant compared his work to that of Copernicus: just as the author of the *Celestial Revolutions* puts the sun in the place of the earth in our planetary system, so the author of the *Critique* places the mind in the center of the phenomenal world and makes the latter dependent upon it. Kant's philosophy is, undoubtedly, the most remarkable and the most fruitful product of modern thought." Like the great Anaxagoras, he lays the emphasis on *mind*, and "distinguishes in every idea, a *material* element, which is furnished *a posteriori* by the senses, and a formal element inseparably bound up with the moral law. It is a *postulate* of pure practical reason . . . but depends upon an *a priori* practical law of unconditioned validity." He further believed that one "must postulate the existence of a cause of nature as a whole, which is distinct from nature, and which is able to connect happiness and morality in exact harmony with each other." Here follows another distinct theistic utterance: "The moral law leads us to postulate not only the immortality of the soul, but the existence of God." "And as this possibility can be established only under condition that God exists, the presupposition of the highest good is inseparably connected with duty, or, in other words, it is morally necessary to hold the existence of God."—Ibid., pp. 295-297. But agnostics have very little to say about conceptions of the mind or theistic contentions: for they are vainly trying to evolve from molecular action the phenomena of mind, such as memory and imagination, thought and reason, feeling and volition, conscience and self-consciousness. They are dumb and dumbfounded in the presence of mental manifestations. In trying to account for mental phenomena, the insanity of sin is clearly made evident by the irrational inductive arguments of materialists.

On the immortality of the soul, Kant well says: "Thus immortality is furnished *a priori* by thought. Every science, therefore, or philosophy, consists of two parts: a pure ra-

tional, or speculative part, and an empirical part.”—Weber, pp. 472 and 475.

It should be said in passing that the word *science* is absolutely prostituted by both Evolution and Eddyism.

Again, “an organized product of nature is one in which all the parts are reciprocally end and means. Nothing in an organized being is useless, or without purpose, and nothing in it can be ascribed to blind natural mechanism.”—Watson, p. 329. One can readily understand why agnostic professors give so little attention to Kant. Recently demented agnosticism and animalized materialism have wrought sad havoc in many institutions of learning. In propagating their specious theories, loose inductive methods of reasoning are employed. Let college faculties restore Logic and Kant to their proper places in their curricula and fewer fallacies and heresies will afflict the Church and the State.

Another great excellence of this famous theistic philosopher is the clear distinction he makes between conception which is the work of the mind *per se*, as distinguished from the body, and perception which is the operation of the mind in getting knowledge through the senses. “Perception and conception . . . are the two elements that enter into all our knowledge.”—*Ibid.*, p. 40. “Perception is by its very nature limited to phenomena.” For man is a duality. He has a physical body composed of matter in which the senses are located, and he has a spiritual nature which God breathed into Adam at his creation and which is the image of God in man. It is mind, and mind only, that remembers, imagines, thinks, reasons, knows, feels, wills, and it is this immortal mind that gives greatness and infinite dignity and superiority to man over all other mundane creations.

Kant was emphatically right when he clearly distinguished between perception which gathers data through the five senses, and conception which is largely independent of external objects. The mind being self-conscious of possessing a self-realizing power, can carry on wonderful processes of reasoning without reference to external things. Physiology is perfectly helpless in the presence of mental phenomena; for Psychology operates in a far higher realm. The former deals only with material things while the latter leads us out

into the more wonderful domains of mental and spiritual realities.

Illustrious Kant was a thinker far in advance of our more recent Herbert Spencer who vainly reasoned about an unknowable God. Though Kant once lost his way in Pure Reason in discussing necessary being, yet he recovers himself, mentally and morally, and "devotes eighty-eight pages to the critique of the theodicy and the proofs of the existence of God."—Weber, p. 460. And the immortal Kant dwells today in the higher realms of the thinking world, philosophical and theological, while Spencer of yesterday with his irrational infidel First Principles is fading from memory. Also Darwin's name and fame are on the wane. Both these defamers of the human race are passing into a well-merited oblivion while theistic Kant, who was born exactly 200 years ago, reigns supreme in the philosophical world; for he reasoned sanely and somewhat like this: *There are entities and they demand an adequate cause and a sufficient reason.*

To Kant belongs this further great distinction. In the rebound from Dark Age dogmas about salvation by works, Calvin naturally went to the other extreme and preached salvation by *grace alone, ignoring the human will, and making all depend upon the divine sovereignty.* The predestination of God determined all destinies. Now, Kant's great postulate on Freedom has helped many fine theologians to realize that *our Heavenly Father respects the human will* in the matter of salvation, and necessarily so: *for without freedom there can be no responsibility.* It should also be remembered that those noble souls, those princes in God's Israel, who formulated the Westminster Confession of Faith were too near the fires and fagots of persecution and martyrdom, to be entirely free from ultra determinations. It was, therefore, by a special Providence, no doubt, that at this time a most distinguished philosopher was raised up to state, define and defend the freedom of the human will, and by so doing he has *greatly* aided the Great Reformed Churches intellectually to accept the larger liberty of the mind of man in the blessed Gospel of free grace. Thus while deluded, Herbert Spencer tried to wreck the Christian Church, Kant

made a most splendid contribution to the theological as well as to the philosophical intellectual wealth of Christendom. To Kant, God was the transcendental ideal. May the time soon come when his divine philosophy and our glorious Christianity may completely emancipate victimized science from the ignoble and degrading effects of old Greek heathen materialism!

LOUIS JEAN RUDOLPHE AGASSIZ

His father was the Protestant pastor of the parish of Motier. Agassiz was a "Swiss naturalist and geologist"—"one of the most eminent naturalists of his time"; for he was a man of rare natural ability, was highly educated and was a most patient and diligent student. In 1829 he took "his degree of doctor of philosophy at Erlangen, and in 1830 that of doctor of medicine at Munich." Then about this time he began publishing works on ichthyology—on fresh-water fish from the Amazon river in Brazil and "fish found in the Lake of Neuchatel." In 1832 he was appointed professor of natural history in the University of Neuchatel. From 1833 to 1844, he published five beautifully illustrated volumes of his *Recherches sur les poissons fossiles*. He thought "that his paleontological labors rendered necessary a new basis of ichthyological classification"—which he made.

"The British Association came to his aid," and "in 1836 the Wallaston medal was awarded" . . . to him "for his work on fossil ichthyology; and in 1838 he was elected a member of the Royal Society." Before this, however, in 1834 he had visited England and had become acquainted with "the labors of Hugh Miller and other geologists." Then, in "the year 1836" he "witnessed the inauguration of a new investigation, which proved to be of the utmost importance to geological science." The subject of Alpine glaciers now attracted his attention, and, according to his thorough way of doing things, "he had a hut constructed upon one of the Aar glaciers, which for a time he made his home, in order to investigate thoroughly the structure and movements of the ice. These labors resulted in the publication of his great work entitled *Etude sur les glaciers*, 1840." "He concluded that at a period geologically recent, Switzerland had been

another Greenland." Also, in 1840 in conjunction with William Buckland, Agassiz made the important discovery concerning glacial action in Scotland, England and Wales. "The discovery was announced to the Geological Society of London."

"In 1842-1846 he issued his *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, a classified list, with references, of all names employed in Zoology for genera and groups—a work of great labor and research."

"In 1846 Agassiz crossed the Atlantic, with the twofold design of investigating the natural history and geology of the United States and delivering a course of lectures on Zoology, by invitation from Mr. J. A. Lowell, at the Lowell Institute at Boston." Finally, he was induced "to settle in the United States, where he remained to the end of his life." In 1847, "he was appointed professor of Zoology and Geology in Harvard University." Also, "in 1852 he accepted a medical professorship of comparative anatomy at Charleston, but this he resigned in two years."

"Volume after volume now proceeded from his pen: some of his writings were popular, but most of them dealt with the higher departments of scientific research." At length his great labors began to tell upon his strength, and in "1865 he started for Brazil, with his wife and a class of qualified assistants." Then in 1871 he made a second excursion, visiting the southern shores of our continent. His death occurred in 1873.

It must be granted that Agassiz was one of the most extensively educated, one of the most learned scientists that ever appeared in Europe or America; for he was always a student of rare ability and untiring diligence. Also, he belonged to that fine class of scientists who possessed unimpeachable integrity and intellectual loyalty to the Holy Scriptures. Now, what does he say about the origin of man on this planet? No doubt at Unitarian Harvard, steeped in Agnosticism, strong pressure was brought to bear upon him to accept the vagaries of Darwin, which *vagaries were then all the vogue*. At that time this antiquated Greek heathen materialism brought down from benighted Thales (640-646

B. C.), was running riot in many colleges. Savants in Europe and literati in America were falling down before this senseless and scienceless deification of matter. But Jean Louis Rodolph Agassiz with his wide range of erudition, with his rare mental sanity, and apparently endowed with a divine intellectual illumination, was too wise and too faithful to God's revealed Word, to forsake the firm foundations of true science, philosophy and Scripture—was too learned, too logical, and too intelligent a Christian to accept a theory of origins based upon the shifting sands of heathen materialism. Therefore, "from first to last he steadily rejected the doctrine of evolution, and affirmed his belief in independent creations."—En. Br., 11th edition.

In a word, the learned Agassiz preferred the glorious account of our origin in the beautiful Garden of Eden to the insane ravings of that benighted heathen Empedocles, who, false in heart and tongue, tried to degrade mankind to the low level of the promiscuously gendered brute creation. Thank the Good Lord for sane and sage philosophers, learned and intellectual scientists, devout and thoughtful theologians who possess nobility of character, integrity of mind and divine intuitions, and who have philosophically, scientifically, and Scripturally clearly proved to us our glorious ancestry in the All-Father Himself.

A story somewhat like this is told of Professor Agassiz at Harvard: It appears that students were in the habit of placing on his desk specimens for his inspection and naming. One day in a merry mood, they placed before him what might be called a composite beetle. They had taken parts from several kinds of insects and had just fastened them together. Agassiz picked up the unique specimen and upon examining it, enlightened the class somewhat after this manner: This specimen is not found in Europe, Asia, or Africa; but it is found in America, and is called *humbug*. The great Agassiz knew humbugs in beetles and students, and he knew humbugs in scientists and philosophers. The most noted naturalists, thinkers and divines have ever opposed the godless rage of this Satanic evolution which has been one of the most *degrading influences* from the last century.—See En. Br.

THE EVIL INFLUENCES OF EVOLUTION IN GENERAL

The special duty of parents is to present to their children fine ideals—ideals that will elevate the child's mind and inspire in it imaginings of beautiful and even celestial realities; for the young mind when properly prompted, will readily take to celestial reveries.

“High o’er the stars you take your soaring flight,
And rove the regions of supernal light.”

How beautiful often are the conceptions of Sunday School scholars concerning the Saviour and the Heavenly Home! But if parents are foolish, and know no better than to teach their children this infidel evolution, which is the invention of Satan for the perversion of the human mind, an irreparable wrong will be inflicted upon the family. For a moment consider the degrading nature of this slander upon our God-created humanity and its necessary beast implications. According to it our life probably started in a slimy place of water and mud among worms and reptiles, where creeping and poisonous things devoured one another. Then there came apes, monkeys and all kinds of savage beasts, and then we came from them. They were our forefathers! What infernal lies are these for parents to teach their eager, questioning, lovable and precious children! The better heathen never taught their children such vile nonsense as that; for they had celestial gods to whom beautiful temples were built. Any nation whose parents teach their children this loathsome evolution, is on the same road as drunken Babylon which was slaughtered in a night for its wickedness, and as polluted Rome which, rotten with sin, fell from its imperial throne at the beginning of the Dark Ages.

But when parents talk about the loving Heavenly Father, the Blessed Jesus their kind Saviour, and the Good and Holy Spirit who can make them good and true, brave and strong to do lots of things to make others noble and happy—when the parents so talk, they kindle upon the altar of the young heart a flame of love to the Blessed Lord that will glow in joyous and triumphant happiness throughout a blissful eternity.

Therefore, let all parents who have true and intelligent affection for their children, read to them the Bible account of our creation in the "image" and "likeness" of God Himself.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them."—Gen. 1:26, 27. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man."—Gen. 2:7, 21, 22. This historical account of our creation is one of the most beautiful and important narratives in the possession of the race. This story is most delightful and profitable for children. It lifts their thoughts to God as their Great Father, and presents to them the beautiful Garden of Eden, which, being of the Lord's planting, was by far the most beautiful spot that ever adorned this earth. There were flowers and fruits, shrubs and trees, bowers and balmy breezes laden with fragrance, fountains and rivers and hills, in the distance lakes and forest and mountains. No doubt there were fish in the water, and fine animals on land, birds of song and beautiful plumage in the air and on the trees. Here is a wonderful cluster of charming stories for children—stories that will elevate their minds and fill their hearts with love and joy, and that are infinitely superior to those of the Satan-inspired evolutionist with his malarial jungle which swarms with low and reptilian life and with vicious and horrible beasts. Thank the Good Lord for the first chapters of Genesis which wicked critics and infidels have always tried—without success—to tear in pieces; but which give us such charming scenery and such divinely inspiring and ennobling incidents. This Holy Spirit's account of our creation in the Garden of Eden is the most beautiful story in all the world's

ancient literature. Two thousand years ago the wicked rejected Christ and chose a murderous robber, and today the same kind of people reject the beautiful Garden of Eden account and accept some hairy animal as their ancient ancestor. The *Lord have mercy on ignorant and perverse humanity!*

Materialism really knows nothing of the origin of things, because evolutionists have been compelled to give up spontaneous generation of even plant life. Properly speaking, Darwin's work on the "Origin of Species" was a misnomer; for all species have their *origin* in the fiat of the Almighty.

Dawson says: "Nature is either a purely imaginary being, a mere figure of speech, or another name for a creative will."—p. 26.

Dawson—"So dangerous is this use of the term evolution, that it may become necessary to abandon the word altogether in purely scientific discussions, and to insist on the terms *causation* and *development*, as covering the two distinct ideas now mixed up under evolution."—p. 27. Dawson further says of evolution: "It seems to enthrone chance or accident or necessity as Lord and Creator, and to reduce the Universe to a mere drift, in which we are embarked as in a ship without captain, crew, rudder, or compass, and without any guiding chart or star."—p. 29. The position of the evolutionists, notwithstanding their pompous pretensions, is utterly unscientific, and disgracefully so.

It has been well said: "You make a man believe that he is nothing more than a developed animal, and he is very apt to act like an animal." This debasing materialism is the very thing that depraved human nature desires; for the conscience-stricken wicked do not wish to meet God. Consequently, they eagerly accept an animal origin. This is the reason why agnostics, infidels, atheists, and all ungodly degenerates are so anxious to prove evolution.

It was Deism and Atheism that produced the French Revolution and the same demoralizing influences so inflamed the selfish and wicked passions of Germany's war lords and land lords that they brought on the Great War. The imperial will deceived the people and crushed them into armor. Evo-

lution and irreligion so debased and degraded generals and rulers that they acted towards women and children more like fiends than human beings. Thus atheized and animalized, they gave the world awful manifestations of unparalleled brutality, hatred and depravity. After the horrors of the Late War, the hypocritical pratings of evolutionists and the profane blasphemies of atheists should forever cease. The despicable deeds of those desperadoes were natural fruits of a material philosophy. Those deluded rulers did not believe that they were the creatures of the Good God; but they did believe that they were the promiscuous progeny of apes, monkeys, etc., etc. Since that is the case, does it not give one a horrible sensation to know that this same evolution is taught at the present time in our schools and colleges? Let these materialists, teachers and professors know that the animalization of our children in this free, happy and enlightened country would bring like disgraces and calamities upon our great Christian Commonwealth. Remember that this poison gas of infidelity is constantly administered to our school children.

The Rev. T. T. Martin, Evangelist, has written a book with a most startling title: "Hell and the High Schools, Christ or Evolution—which?" In chapter VI are the following statements on "The Effects of Evolution on the Teachers of It":

"When the International Peace Congress assembled in Paris in 1900, L'Univers made this meaningful statement: 'The spirit of peace has fled from the earth, because Evolution has taken possession of it.' 'But now that men are looked upon as children of apes, what matters it whether they are slaughtered or not?' Witness Germany, who believed and taught it. Witness the revelation in the High Schools of St. Louis, Chicago, and other cities."

"Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr sent out a questionnaire to over five thousand scientists, those who stand and teach our sons and daughters, and from the answers he states that over half of them do not believe in a personal God, nor in the existence of the soul after death; yet almost to a man they once believed in the Bible and that Christ was our Saviour, but they were taught evolution by their teachers."

“George Romanes, the great Evolutionist, who was swept far out to sea by evolution, yet who returned and accepted the Saviour shortly before dying, tells his experience: ‘The views that I entertained on this subject (Plan in Revelation) when an under-graduate (i.e., the ordinary orthodox views) were abandoned in the presence of Evolution.’ In this condition he tells us: ‘I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God, the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness . . . when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which was once mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as I now find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible.’”

Evangelist Martin in Ch. VII, shows the “effects of Evolution on Students.” “Germany’s ‘superman’ turned out to be an incarnate devil; but before that stage was reached, Evolution swept the young men and women, the boys and girls of Germany from the Bible as God’s Word and from Jesus Christ as Saviour and Redeemer.”

“The Hon. Thomas Dwight, professor of Anatomy in Harvard University, puts it clearly: ‘One of our greatest curses has been the Atheistic popular lecturer, the purveyor of sham science on the one hand and the hater of religion on the other. He spreads about the wildest theories as established facts, claiming that the whole social fabric, religion and all, should be remodeled to suit the new revelation. He does not know whether there is a God or not; but he does know man came from the ape . . . The mischief that such men do is great, indeed. The young man sees the popular lecturer praised and flattered, is dazzled by his plausibility and brilliancy. The plain fact that his hero is but a quack does not occur to him.’”

The Rev. L. W. Munhall, D.D., the noted Methodist Evangelist, cites a number of instances where parents with tear-dimmed eyes have told him of how they have sent their children to Methodist schools for the purpose of strengthening the faith that was in them, to find them graduating at last,

as confirmed infidels. Without apology he mentions several Universities and other outstanding institutions. These institutions fully deserve this public rebuke which dear Dr. Munhall has given them. Their mental debility makes us ashamed of them, and we dislike to name them. He reports a bishop's daughter who declared that at the University her faith was destroyed and it took her six months after returning to her home to feel that she was back on the rock Christ; and she declared that her experience was a common one with the girls of that college."

"Professor Leuba states that he questioned students from nine colleges and that 15 per cent of the Freshmen, 30 per cent of the Juniors, and 45 per cent of the graduates had given up the Christian religion. It is in proportion as they are taught Evolution—the higher the class the more Evolution is taught."

Here is the testimony of a young lady in a letter to her parents: "I was just about gone, and Mr. . . . saved me; he gave me absolute proof of some things that the professor hooted at and said were impossible. Oh, mother and daddy, for goodness' sake, don't send the boys to this university. I was conceited enough to think that it wouldn't hurt me, and that I could sit through that stuff and come out unharmed, but oh, what a fool I was! As it is, it will take me some time to get over it. But please, oh, please, do not send the boys there! They can't stand it any more than I can. You get the same thing in sociology, in history, in psychology, and in biology. Everything is teeming with it . . . It's too dangerous to fool with things like this.

"Now I know this has worried you, but don't let it too much. Only, don't send the boys to this university. . . . It makes me tremble now to think how far I had gone and thinking all the time that it was Christ leading me, when it was the devil!"

"If it is this bad in a denominational, what will it be in tax-supported schools?"

"The brilliant Editor of the great daily, *The Commercial Appeal*, of Memphis, Tenn., says in an editorial, 'We have found but a single young person who has returned from col-

lege in the last decade who was not an outspoken disciple of Darwin and from the discretion with which he spoke, we have grave doubts about him.' ”

Here follows a very sad letter:

“May 8, 1921.

“Dear Sir:

“I was the son of a Christian mother; went to college, was taught by infidel teachers, studied Evolution, New Thought, under men like . . . traveled extensively, came home, insulted my mother; went the primrose route, and today I am a mental, spiritual and physical wreck. My soul is a starving skeleton; my heart a petrified rock; my mind is poisoned and as fickle as the wind, and my faith unstable as water. I broke the heart of my mother, disappointed my friends, stood before my class on graduation day, delivered the valedictory address, lauded ‘Darwin’s Theory’ to the skies . . . I have run the gauntlet, I am at the end of the rope, Oh, wretched man that I am . . . I wish I had never seen a college . . . I wish to testify that Mother was right, and yearn for her Saviour, Jesus Christ, to be mine. And I call upon you and your great church, who, I learn, still believe in the old Bible and the power of prayer to save, pray that I may be saved under the blood of Christ and reunited with Mother in the Heavenly Kingdom.

“(Signed) ‘A Mother’s Son.’ ”

“A clergyman, a part of whose Sunday evening service is devoted to answering questions that are sent him, recently had this: ‘Why is it that so many college students lose their faith in immortality and in God?’

“That depends.

“According to newspaper reports, Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn., for the forty-fifth successive time devoted eleven days in February to a concerted effort to lead all the students into the Christian life. The result was that out of an enrollment of 800, only twenty students are not professing Christians. With their systematized follow-up efforts, the twenty may be won for Christ. Maryville has again and again graduated classes in which every student was

a professing Christian. The teaching there does not conduce to losing but confirming faith in immortality and in God."

"We had a deacon whose two sons were members of the church. One went to Centre College and the other to Illinois State University. The Centre student came home still a good Christian, but the Illinois young man came home a religious wreck. The picture he gave of the moral condition of the State school was pitifully pigmented with black. 'It is run by booze,' he said. This was more than twenty years ago. It seems to be generally understood that in most state schools teaching in behalf of the Christian religion is forbidden, but irreligion has free exploitation, the tendency of which is to extinguish belief in immortality and in God."—The B. C., Aug. and Sept., 1923.

Many a good man who has given largely to found and endow a Christian College, and who has sent his children to it, has been grieved to the heart when his children came home filled with unbelief in Christianity; for they had been taught this infidel evolution. There is a very emphatic Scripture name for those professors who take the Lord's pay for doing the devil's work. This word "hypocrite" is used eight times by our Blessed Lord Himself in the 23rd Chapter of Matthew. Infidels and evolutionists do not build colleges for themselves, but they are quite successful in *stealing Christian* schools. Evidently all the hypocrites did not pass away with Judas Iscariot. The moral mental mortality among college professors is one of the most humiliating and appalling facts of our times.

Before Gladstone removed the religious tests (which was one of the great mistakes of that fine Christian statesman), the professors of Oxford and Cambridge in science, mathematics, etc., as well as in theology, were required to accept the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as found in the Prayer Book of the Church of England. "To be a member of the Church of England was a necessary condition precedent for holding most university and college offices by the Act of Uniformity of 1662." "Religious tests remained in the English Universities until 1871, in Dublin University until 1873, and in the Scottish Universities until 1889." Those Articles

contain a wonderfully fine consensus of Christian Faith, and kept those Universities loyal to Christianity for centuries. Germany had no such tests, and today the whole world is amazed at the difference between the product of Christian teaching in the British Isles and evolution teaching in Germany.

Further, what is the reason why Wesley and Whitefield had such a remarkable and sudden success in their blessed Evangelism? *They did not need to prove that the Bible was God's inspired Word, or that Christ was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."* For many decades all the great verities of our Holy Christianity had been taught in all the Protestant Parish Churches in England, Wales and the north of Ireland. While in Scotland the Westminster Confession of Faith had fulfilled its holy mission. Therefore, the Methodists found a people that had been indoctrinated in the fundamental truths of Christianity. They knew the great Creeds and formulas of faith. Upon this fine Protestant foundation, the Wesleys and their helpers went forth calling men to repentance and reformation of life, and preaching regeneration and sanctification. Also they laid great stress upon the universality of the Atonement in the Precious Blood of the Lamb of God and upon the Witness of the Holy Spirit to the believer. Further, Bishop Butler had answered the infidels of England and the Deists of France, and there were neither destructive critics to mutilate the Bible, nor mentally degenerate professors to revive old Greek heathen materialism.

Humanly speaking, the great Methodist Revival would have been impossible without the orthodox teachings of the English Church Prayer Book with its great Creeds, fine Prayers, and its "Thirty-nine Articles of Religion." These immature and uninformed people that prate against Creeds and fine statements of great doctrines do not realize that they were the solid foundation of Methodism, the greatest Revival of modern times. They also forget that the spiritual interests of the soul are the all-important concerns of human life. According to Socrates matters of the highest interest "demand of us accuracy of statement." Mr. Feeble-

mind does not like creeds and fine statements of the fundamental verities of our Holy Christianity. Not being thoughtfully inclined, he would decapitate Christianity and longs for a vague gospel of GUSH, sentiment and feeling. The main appeals of our Blessed Lord are to the mind of man. Paul even says, "But we have the mind of Christ."—I Cor. 2:16. "On earth there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but mind."—Phavorinus.

It does appear that the Governing Boards, especially of Denominational Colleges, ought to be exceedingly careful about the mental attitude of professors toward Christianity. From all accounts blind unbelief, which is just common infidelity, and evolution, which is just old Greek heathen materialism, are making dreadful havoc in institutions of learning. The Good Lord deliver us from professors possessed with the demons of unbelief! It is euphemism to merely say that this evolution is unorthodox; it is an *intellectual disgrace* to the colleges of both Europe and America.

The thoughtless wag may reply, "Well, whose doxy is it? Your doxy, or my doxy?" Foolish man! it is neither your doxy, nor my doxy. It is the Bible doxy; that is, it is the Lord's doxy. That answer is on inspired authority. See I Thes. 2:13.

WHAT ARE THE BELIEVERS IN EVOLUTION?

It has been shown that the benighted heathen of ancient Greece were evolutionists 600 years B. C., and no doubt before that the Egyptians with their egg theory of origins and their sacred bulls which they embalmed, accepted evolution which has always been Satan's explanation of Cosmos.

Concerning the Antediluvians, it is written: "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," and that "the earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence!"—Gen. 6:5 and 11. These bloody Antediluvians became haters of both God and man. Now, it may be that they were the original patrons of evolution.

But referring to our own time, you will find that the worthless, the I. W. W.'s, the tramps, the anarchists, and

the idle-vicious elements are thorough-going evolutionists. These undesirable parasites on society always have been and always will be classed among base-minded materialists. Unbelievers, such as agnostics, infidels and atheists, reject the beautiful account of our creation as found in Genesis. The atheists of France went so far as to put out of the schoolbooks all mention of God; so that the rising generation would not know anything about the Supreme Being. Necessarily, therefore, the children grew up ignorantly believing that mud or something else made plants and plants made animals and animals made man. Likewise, demented atheistic Germany, following the unprincipled Haeckel, with great avidity accepted Darwinism. The irreligious agnostics of England, notwithstanding a strong enlightened sentiment, so preached this mental prostitution that quite a following was secured among the unregenerate. Also, our free-thinkers and deniers of our Blessed Lord and Saviour have prostrated themselves before this Satanic delusion.

The unclean, the lewd, the lecherous whose base lusts are their gods—of course the underworld revels in evolution. "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron," they plunge into all excesses of the flesh. Of the wicked it is said: "God is not in all his thoughts."—Psa. 10:4. The impure do not look up to Heaven for a smile from their Heavenly Father, for they dread His just judgments and try to find refuge in this diabolical delusion.

The demon-possessed in the days of our Lord's Incarnation always shrank away from His glorious Presence. The evil-spirits knew well who was their Creator and the Creator of all; but those whom they controlled, such as sorcerers, witches, necromancers, had evolution inspiration from the demons dwelling in them.

Idolators, ancient and modern, worshipers of images of gold and silver, worshipers of beasts, such as the Egyptians as well as our modern evolutionists who have adopted apes, monkeys, etc., etc., as their progenitors and as their gods—all these are believers in this wicked slander on our God-created race. The utterly depraved, the vicious, the loath-

some—all these are ardent and loud advocates of this vile slander on our divinely created humanity.

The low and debased worldlings do not believe in the Heavenly Father as their Creator. They delight in Satan's explanation of things. Most certainly, then, it becomes all thoughtful, intelligent Christian people to think well before accepting a theory which had its origin in the most benighted and wicked periods of human history and which today is held by the nondescript classes—the degraded undesirables of all nations.

Also, it should be remembered that the Blessed Lord does not make His revelations to mankind through blind idolators, blatant infidels, unclean defilers of the race, or demon-possessed maniacs; but "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and they gave us the "Word of God." In that Blessed Book we are told who made us, where we were made, and according to what pattern we were created. It is, therefore, only through dense ignorance or culpable mental perversity, that persons will reject the Good Lord's own blessed account of our creation in the Garden of Eden, and will intellectually consort with the most debased and degraded, the most vile and wicked characters that have stained the earth with innocent blood and polluted it with unutterable vileness—characters that have disgraced humanity and blasphemed the Almighty. Have no fellowship with unbelievers: "for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?—II Cor. 6:14-16. All the wicked and depraved are evolutionists. All Christians ought to know that our righteous God does *not make such* the bearers of truth to His Church and people.

COMPLAINTS OF STUDENTS ABOUT TEACHERS AND TEXT-BOOKS

Some students have justly complained that the text-books on Physiology, Psychology, Zoology, Biology, etc., are generally impregnated with animalizing theories, and that instructors sometimes favor these fallacious teachings. For

instance, a Chicago professor thus begins his work on Physiology:

"A. Living Substance: Protoplasm.

"1. The Physical Properties of Protoplasm.

"2. The Chemical Properties of Protoplasm," etc.

Then on page 25 are the following statements:

"It is remarkable that many of the philosophers of antiquity promulgated theories which are again, after a lapse of twenty-five centuries, forming the foundations of modern science. This is especially true of the theories regarding the origin and development of living nature. Anaximander (620 B. C.) believed that man descended from animal-like progenitors, who originally lived in water . . . Empedocles (504 B. C.) believed that, in the realm of living nature, plants originated first, then lower animals, then higher animals, and finally man." Is it not an amazing thing that *our up-to-date scientists* hark away back to the dim dawn of the Dark Age of Greek heathen materialism for the *foundations of Science*? But truly *intelligent scientists* can have no consideration for the *sandy foundations* of antiquated and discarded heathen materialism.

Darwin himself was a master hand at manufacturing fallacies. His famous major premise which he used about 800 times was this: "We may well suppose." It used to be thought that *a Science consists of the arranged and certified facts in any department of human knowledge*. But, according to Darwin and his unscientific disciples, it consists of bald assertions and foolish suppositions and unclassifiable similarities. This modern so-called science just throws the whole flora and fauna of the world into absolute confusion. According to its lawless developments, there would be no cosmos but a universal *chaos*.

It certainly is high time that parents, school authorities and legislative bodies arose in their might and protected the rising generation from this old antiquated materialism with its *plant-beast science* which tends to demoralize the children and students of our Christian country.

Rudolf Virchow, the noted German pathologist, whose "eightieth birthday was celebrated in Berlin amid a brilliant gathering of men of science," when "all Europe united to

do him honor"—Virchow opposed the unprincipled Haeckel, who falsified plates showing various vertebral columns, when Haeckel proposed that the principles of evolution should be taught in the elementary schools—Virchow opposed the measure "on the ground that they were not yet proved, and that it was mischievous to teach an hypothesis which still remained in the speculative state."—En. Br.

But when great scientists like Professor William Bateson, F.R.S., etc., President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, will publicly declare before a Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, that today Scientists are "unable to offer any explanation for the genesis of species," it is most certainly high time for the State and the Church to expel this unclean evolution from our schools and our Houses of Prayer. Our Blessed Lord drove clean animals out of the precincts of the temple, and how much more should this ill-gendered evolution be driven out of our halls of learning and sanctuaries of divine worship!

While there are serious perversions of truth in certain educational institutions, yet the schools can boast of some illustrious professors. Professor William Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, will ever be remembered as a fine scholar and a most reliable exegete. For nearly fifty years he was "professor of Biblical and Oriental Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary." He ably defended the Pentateuch against that erratic Bishop Colenso of England. His two works entitled, "The Unity of the Book of Genesis" and "The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," enlightened me on the thoroughly destructive nature of German Higher Criticism. If all American theologians had possessed good sense, deep piety, sound learning and a "spiritual understanding," and had studied Professor Green's writings, they would have rejected the Harper-Chicago University leadership, and our Divinity Schools would have saved themselves from the humiliation of having been duped by transatlantic infidelity.

Also, Methodism has had fine theological professors whom the Church delights to honor and remember. The late Professor Luther T. Townsend, S.T.D., has left precious mem-

ories. He made valuable contributions to our literature. He is the author of "Credo," "God-man," "Fate of Republics," "Evolution or Creation," "Collapse of Evolution," etc., etc. He was a great teacher in the Methodist Boston School of Theology, and will ever be regarded as one of the true immortals in the higher realms of thought and knowledge. He lifted up a standard against this destructive criticism which has had such an enfeebling and degenerating effect upon Christian evangelism. Also, Townsend mightily and constantly opposed this evolution abomination which has had such a disgraceful rage during the last half century both in Europe and America.

St. Peter and St. Paul as well as our Blessed Lord most earnestly warn us against false teachers or professors.

II Peter 2:1: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord hath bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

I Tim. 1:7: "Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." Here Paul is up-to-date; for evolutionists cannot give satisfactory definitions or explanations, and those which they try to give they neither understand nor can explain.

II Tim. 4:2-5: "Preach the word . . . For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;

"And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.

"But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." Thus Paul exhorted Timothy.

The Lord Himself describes false-hearted and double-minded teachers in that most solemn chapter, the 23rd of Matthew. The application will be made apparent when certain verses are modernized. In this important chapter, the Divine Master accurately and minutely describes the appalling mental lapsus of our modern simian idolators. It really amounts to an indictment, conviction and sentence of false

teachers. These stern statements which follow and which show that it does make a difference whether a person teaches truth or error, whether a professor teaches Christianity or evolution.

In ancient times the scribe was the writer, the transcriber and the teacher of the Law, the Prophets and the other Holy Writings. He was the theological professor, and in modernizing this important chapter, it would be quite proper in some verses to put *theological professor for scribe*. Sad to say, this would be quite correct, because of late there have been cases of mental and spiritual mortality in certain Divinity Schools. Years ago Harvard was so badly infested with heresy, that Andover was started; but unfortunately it has recently been closed. Also the Presbyterians have had trouble with this hairy Simian cult. Moreover, it is intimated that we Methodists ought to have trouble; for some of our *sacred scholastics*, it is affirmed, are entertaining very *reverent* thoughts in reference to some *unclean* and *unknown* hairy beasts whom they devoutly expect soon to welcome as their *august primogenitors*. Since these unclean creatures take the place of God in the origin of the human race, they logically become *evolution deities*. For myself, if necessary and if allowed a choice, I would prefer the fish of Anaximander, or the clean sacred bulls of Egypt, or, still better, my own ancestors, and, like the clever Japanese, enjoy ancestral worship.

We have seen what St. Peter and St. Paul thought about these agnostic propagandists; but—What Saith the Blessed Lord Himself? Turn to Matthew, chapter 23:—

Verse 13: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Subtle teachers have rejected God as their true Creator and having accepted this animalization of our race, easily rob innocent students of their faith in the great verities of our Holy Christianity, and one of the principal verities is that God created man in His own "image" and "likeness." The professor thus becomes a stumbling block over whom the deceived students fall into the "blackness of darkness forever." On that false teacher will be the

blood of souls in the day of judgment. It is an awful crime to shake the Christian faith of students in those glorious opening chapters of the Word of God. That is the special work of Satan and infidels. Truly, they go not in themselves and they hinder those that would enter the kingdom of grace and glory.

Verse 14: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." The dear professor in raising an endowment for his Divinity School, is most unctuous in prayer when the wealthy are importuned for funds, that the future ministry may be well versed in the essential doctrines revealed in the Holy Scriptures and be therefore able to instruct the congregations committed to his care about the Almighty as the Creator, Jesus Christ as the Redeemer and the Holy Spirit as the regenerator and Sanctifier. But when the college gets an endowment then weak-minded professors, deceived by destructive criticism, begin by dethroning God as the Creator and denying the true inspiration of the Sacred Volume. In this way the minds of the unsuspecting students are poisoned "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."—II Col. 2:8. In this way sacred funds are too often misappropriated. Agnostics as a rule do not build schools, they just *steal Christian Colleges*. According to the Saviour men that do that are hypocrites. This degeneration of institutions of learning the world over, is an appalling fact, and plainly proves the mental unreliability of those afflicted with "the pride of learning." In their conceit of knowledge they reject the Blessed Gospel, which the Loving Lord has made plain and simple on purpose, so that the poor, the unlearned and the busy might run and read and understand the precious truths of salvation.

Verse 15: 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." These subtle instructors will inform the sincere and pious youth that he must forget the kindergarten ideas of home and Sunday School, and adopt

the conclusions of scientists and higher critics. These latter have taught that man is an evolution from animals and have decided that the Bible account of creation is only a fine piece of fiction like the mythology of Homer's Iliad and Hesiod's Theogony. Then, in a year or two, under infidel influences, the young preacher's faith is completely destroyed, and he becomes an avowed agnostic. This causes great grief to his parents and to his Christian friends. But with the impetuosity of youth, he goes down to the depths of unbelief, despises the faith of his fathers, openly opposes the Church of Christ, and becomes twofold more the child of hell than his sanctimonious and hypocritical teachers. No wonder that the Saviour here follows with:

Verses 16-22: "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor!

"Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?

"And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty.

"Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?

"Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon.

"And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein.

"And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon."

How many like these old hypocrites, are today in colleges and Sunday Schools, filling the receptive minds of children and youth with the fallacious traditions and hypotheses of wicked unbelievers and full-fledged agnostics and unscientific evolutionists, instead of teaching the glorious verities of Holy Writ! These ill-informed instructors ignore the doctrines of our Lord and magnify the puerile traditions of apostates. Oh! how foolish and blind are these destructive unbelievers! They deify mud and monkeys, and dethrone the Almighty. They preach a "Gospel of Dirt" which

denies the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour. Bunyan speaks of sinners spending time raking up straws while crowns are dangling over their heads. It is pitiable to see *great scientists* gloating over the rotten cranium of some old savage, being tremblingly anxious to prove thereby a beast ancestry for themselves. Satan surely makes intellectual imbeciles. The old serpent is merciless on his dupes. They are his "abjects and must obey."

Again, well might the Saviour say:

Verses 23, 24: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

"Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

There was a certain hierarch, who, in addressing a number of young ministers on an important occasion, made little or no mention of the eternal significance of their sacred calling but admonished them about dustless shoes and spotless lapels. He himself *was scientific* and had swallowed holus-bolus, the hairy ancestor which Darwin had provided for his deluded followers.

Napoleon was right when he said something like this to his atheist friends, "You make up for not believing in God, by believing in everything else." Evolutionists and Christian Scientists have unbounded capacity for foundationless faith, and they seem to be devoid of any instinctive or intuitive discernment concerning the vast difference between truth and error, and to be helplessly ignorant of the laws of evidence. They will accept with avidity any wild theory of origins which eliminates God and rejects the Bible account of creation—which account is based upon the best evidence in the possession of the human race. Again, well might the Saviour say:

Verses 25, 26: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess.

"Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also."

Too often in Seminaries special attention is given to external and minor accomplishments, while the preparation of the heart, the furnishing of the mind and the building of character—essentials for the divine work of the pastorate—are almost totally neglected. Of course, careless and awkward and unseemly poses in the pulpit are highly reprehensible. But in too many schools there is the agnostic trend which ignores sin and salvation, Christ and Belial, regeneration and sanctification—ignores the inspiration of the Scriptures and the Deity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour. The Colleges are in duty bound to give the churches a full-orbed ministry of pure and noble character. This will certainly not be done by appointing as instructors inefficient pastors, or men of doubtful mental reliability. Every effort should be made to inspire students with a love of the true, the beautiful and the good, and with love to God and man—to inspire them to imitate the Blessed Saviour who was glorified in His crucifixion; that is, in His sacrifice for humanity. There is this further consideration; if the inner life is true and righteous, clean and loving, the outer life will naturally be ennobled and sublimated, and made worthy of the sacred offices of the man of God.

Verses 27, 28: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones."

"Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."

Recently there has been a revival of this most loathsome form of materialism, which has literally disgraced some seminaries. This nauseating evolution has been taught by a few very plausible and pleasant professors. But though they are members of a Christian College faculty, they carry in their minds the rotten bones of dead theories, and their hearts are not right with God. The power of evil has made them subtle, and yet obtuse to moral obligations. They do not realize that they are violating ordination vows, and that they are not teaching what the salary and the Church demand. They are in a false position, and are justly chargeable with "hypocrisy and iniquity." They desire descent from some animal

rather than descent from God as our Creator in the Garden of Eden. They, therefore, prefer an animal ancestry, and that which we prefer to God is our *idol*. Thus these genial but false-hearted professors are idolators, and have committed mental prostitution. *Fundamentally they are unreliable.*

The proper course is to seek the Lord with a penitent heart and an humble mind, acknowledging and bewailing this sinful lapsus into mental infidelity, and praying for the mind that was in Christ—praying for a “spiritual understanding,” and praying for pardon of the heinous sin of preferring an animal ancestry and rejecting the Heavenly Father, thus acting wickedly as those who preferred Barabbas to Christ. This awful evolution leads to sin, death and hell. But true repentance and faith bring pardon through the precious blood of Christ. Then it will be the professor’s joy to teach “the truth as it is in Jesus.” “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.” But to those that will not repent, Christ continues:

Verses 29-33: “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous,

“And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.

“Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.

“Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.

“Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”

While these hypocritical scribes and Pharisees, these teachers of the Law, were saying that they would not have shed the blood of the prophets, they were at that very time plotting to put to death the Greatest of all the prophets, even their own Messiah. Likewise, today in some theological colleges “they crucify . . . the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.”—Heb. 6:6. What is to be said of those professors who slander the Blessed Virgin Mary and blaspheme the “Holy Child Jesus,” and prefer some hairy animal to God as their great progenitor? Those false teachers also

try to explain away the glorious miracles of the Word of God. They undermine the historic foundations of the Holy Scriptures, and prostitute their learning to the service of error. In destroying the Christian faith of the coming ministry, they betray a solemn trust, and endanger the very salvation of their students. Woe unto you, traitors to the Kingdom of our Blessed Lord. It is no wonder that the Saviour in His righteous indignation exclaimed: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" These modern Balaams, loving the rewards of unrighteousness and the praises of the wicked, yield to the seductive influences of heresy, and enjoy an empty pre-eminence among the uncircumcised Philistines of unbelief. These wicked teachers have rejected the Saviour and have chosen an animal ancestor, just as Israel frequently forsook Jehovah and chose to worship Moloch or Baal, the gods of their heathen neighbors. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."—Heb. 10:31. This chapter is an appalling denunciation of those hypocrites who eat the Lord's bread and then do the devil's work. These professors are the real hypocrites and are thoroughly exposed and denounced in this most solemn chapter of Holy Writ:

These hypocrites thy Word assail,
And cause the Churches to bewail,
That learned dons have taught our youth
Agnostic shams instead of truth.

O Lord, have mercy, we implore,
Allow false guides to teach no more;
Inspire to preach thy truth divine,
Which on the sacred pages shine.

No more they'll slander Mary's name,
Or Son of God and Man defame,
Or trace to dark and dismal den
The noble race of God-made men.

The wicked choose a creature vile,
That may have spawn'd on banks of Nile;
But Christians trace their blessed birth
To Him who rules both Heaven and Earth.

PART III

IS EVOLUTION SCRIPTURAL ?

"Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam"

It is well-nigh the universal belief of mankind that there is a Supreme Being. But how should He be defined? This is Miley's definition: "God is an eternal personal Being of absolute knowledge, power, and goodness." Probably, it is a little clearer to say: "*God is an absolute and eternal Personality infinite in power, wisdom and goodness.*" The apostle John gives two most beautiful and comprehensive statements descriptive of the Almighty: "God is light."—I Jno. 1:5. Also, there is that still more blessed and wonderful revelation which is twice made: "God is love."—I Jno. 4:8 and 16. Human speech could not utter more illuminating and comforting announcements in making known our glorious Creator. In these statements the apostle has reached the supreme limit of revelation in describing the Lord God of hosts. That "God is love" is the most glorious revelation ever made to mortals or angels.

But some ill-informed persons have been rash enough to question the reliability of the Genesis account of the creation. They affirm that Moses is a myth and that the Pentateuch was not written by him. Indeed, some are so spiritually blind as to imagine that the more ancient portions of Holy Scripture are simply mythological lore. Well, was Moses a myth?

Count the number of times his name is mentioned in the Bible, and mentioned amid historic and matter-of-fact settings and, according to Young's Concordance, you will find that he is named about 890 times. Now, if to this number we add the 310 times that Abram (the same as Abraham) is named, we have a total of 1,200 mentions for both. But there are only 1,089 chapters in the whole Bible; therefore, for these two persons alone there are more than 1,200 falsehoods—more than one for each chapter in the Bible. But

frequent mention is also made of Adam and Eve, Enoch and Noah, Elijah and Elisha, the patriarchs and the prophets. But if, according to these miserable critics, all these are also myths, accordingly our Bible literally overflows with false statements, and has more falsehoods to the page than any other book in the public libraries. But such a conclusion is an appalling absurdity. It is, as the geometrician would say, a *reductio ad absurdum*. This is a clear case where heresy leads to absurdity. The Church, both Jewish and Christian, has always maintained that Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible, and that the account of the creation was inspired by the Holy Spirit. These facts have been established by the learning of Christendom.

Yet certain critics, regarding themselves as super-scholastics, and calling themselves "higher critics," have brought in an evil report of the "Word of God." They have questioned its unity and authorship. In a word, they have denied its inspiration and claim that Genesis has been made up of different documents by different and unknown authors. Their imaginary Elohist authors are represented by E, the Jahvist by J, and the Priestly authors who wrote the priestly code by P.

While these destructive critics are an annoyance, they have ceased to be a real menace; for the Blessed Lord has raised up men of superior learning and ability who are also highly gifted with a "spiritual understanding." Among these foremost defenders of the faith must be mentioned Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford who, I think, is a Hebrew Christian. He has unanswerably rebuked these mistaken critics in a work of splendid logic and scholarship, entitled "Lines of Defense of the Biblical Revelation." Of course, being a fine Semitic scholar, he is specially qualified for his great work. Now what are his opinions on this unlearned and impious attack upon the Holy Scriptures?

At the close of a fine argument against the unreliable critics he says: "The importance of this result is that it seriously damages the modern criticism of the Pentateuch."—p. 70.

In speaking of the Bible of the Jews, he says: "If any one glances over a copy of the Rabbinic Bible, he will assuredly be struck by the care and trouble which the Jews have devoted to their Sacred Books."—p. 211. The scribes were the official copyists of the Holy Scriptures, and their work was sacredly exact. Also, it should be remembered "that the Jews were allowed to write nothing except the Old Testament." "This assertion is rightly regarded as indisputably by Seadyah in the tenth century and Rashi in the eleventh. This means that nothing but the old Testament might be written; the rest of the matter possessed by the Jews was to be preserved orally."—p. 232. If nothing else was written where did J, E and P get their documents with which they patched up the Pentateuch?

Further, Margoliouth asserts: "That all existing copies of the Hebrew Old Testament are ultimately derived from one." The one source was the original inspired "Word of God" which was inerrant and infallible—exactly as the Good Lord intended it to be, and He is *infallible*.—p. 240. The Jew has been faithful to the trust he received and has transmitted to the Christian Church a remarkably true copy of the original lively Oracles of God.

Evidently Margoliouth does not think much of these so-called higher critics, for he says: "The process of deliberately falsifying evidence in order to avoid a pitiful conclusion does not commend itself as either honest or intelligent; but he knows little of human nature who supposes that less than 99 per cent of mankind would resort to it if tempted."—243. This higher criticism not only from a literary point of view, but also from a moral standpoint, has been highly discreditable. The real scholars have been detecting their baseless assumptions.

Margoliouth makes a fine reference to inspiration: "The lost literatures," he says, "that come to light rarely have any value of their own. Egypt and Assyria produced monuments which were long lost, but now are found and deciphered. Who reads them except out of mere curiosity, or to aid him in some other study? Indian literature is now as easy of access as Greek; but who cares for it? One or two isolated morsels, perhaps, are known beyond professional circles, but

nothing else. The Bible itself explains this problem by the theory that the best of Israelitish literature was communicated to its authors from *without*—that it was the result of special favors conferred on privileged numbers of the race. ‘Men spake as they were moved.’ . . . Truly this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.”—pp. 245-6. There is no literature of mere men fit to be placed beside the inspired Word of God to make up a creation story or a system of theology. The stamp of inspiration makes the Bible absolutely superior and that is where Margoliouth places the Sacred Volume.

Again he asserts: “And therefore the criticism of the Pentateuch collapses.”—p. 285. Further, he says: “Our age, then, can offer a very tolerable illustration of men who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. If complication renders a hypothesis improbable, then let us hear no more of J, E and P.”—p. 290.

Now, what Margoliouth did for English Theology, James Orr, Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow, did for the Scottish Divines; and Professor William Henry Green of Princeton Theological Seminary did for this country. Green’s “Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch” and his “Unity of Genesis” helped many a minister in the hour of intellectual peril. Thus consecrated learning has completely vindicated the claim of the Holy Scriptures to inspiration.

In the spirit of humility and dependence upon the Divine Spirit, this transcendently wonderful account of creation is taken as the subject for consideration.

Gen. 1:1: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”

There is no *the* in the original, and a more correct rendering would be: “In *a* beginning.” The latter translation is preferable; for it opens out a far wider range of thought. During the infinite past, what numberless creations have taken place in the vast realms of the divine activity! The beginning of earth’s career is a matter so insignificant in the boundless universe of the infinite Being. Hence Herschfelder’s rendering is better: “In *a* beginning” God created the heaven and the earth. This beginning was “a period of

remote and unknown antiquity, hid in the depths of eternal ages. Then the materials or substance of our universe were created." But for vast æons of time they were in darkness and confusion—were "without form and void."

This word created is found in 42 places in the Old Testament. According to Tregelles, in his Hebrew Manual, he gives as first meaning—"created." Davies in his Hebrew and Chaldec Lexicon gives—"to cut or carve; hence to form, to create, esp. of God's making or creating the world." Brown, Driver, and Briggs, in their Hebrew Lexicon give "shape, create," etc. Roy, in his Hebrew Lexicon gives—"I. He created, caused to exist, spring forth as the world from nothing." According to the Rabbins "God created the substance of the earth."

The use of *Bara* as found in the Holy Scriptures:

In this first chapter five times the verb "created" is used. He "created the heaven and the earth," "created great whales" and "every living creature that moveth," "created man in His own image," "created them male and female." Twice in this 27th verse the Good Lord tells us we were created in His image.

Gen. 2:4: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."

Gen. 5:1, 2: "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him. Male and female created He them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created."

Deut. 4:32: "The day that God created man upon the earth."

Psa. 89:12: "The north and the south Thou hast created them." Why mention the north and the south? Because God has polarized this planet for the mariner. This polarization seems to be universal and it may centralize the whole Universe in the Holy City of the Eternal.

Isa. 40:26: "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might." Even to name his works requires infinite wisdom.

How much more wisdom and power were required to create them!

Isa. 45:12: "I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their hosts have I commanded."

Jer. 27:5: "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm."

Amos 4:13: "For, lo, He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, The Lord, The God of hosts, is His name."

The Hebrew word for create means to make something out of nothing. Paul states the case: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."—Heb. 11:3. Here the apostle assures us "that the world was made out of nothing, not out of primeval chaos."—The Cambridge Bible.

Another peculiarity of this verse should be noted. The name of God is in the plural while the verb *bara*, created, is in the singular. The pedantry of unbelief may pretend to ignore the significance of such facts, disregarding the greater fact that this Bible is the Word of an absolutely accurate Being, and may not discern the divine purpose in thus blending the plural and the singular. But to the sensitive mind of the thoughtful Christian this common practice of putting Elohim, which is Gods, with a singular verb, there will arise the thought that the first verse of the Bible gives intimation of the fundamental doctrine of our Holy Christianity, namely, the Plurality in Unity of the Holy Trinity.

Jamieson, the commentator, well remarks: "By this use here in the plural form, is obviously taught at the beginning of the Bible, a doctrine clearly revealed in other parts of it, viz., that though God is one, there is a plurality of persons in the Godhead—Father, Son and Spirit, who are engaged in the creative work."

Again, the word "heaven" is in the dual. J. M. Herschfelder says: "The dual form of the word probably indicates its

twofold meaning, namely, our atmosphere and the solar system." But some think there is an irregular plural, and that would include Paul's "third heaven," mentioned in II. Cor. 12:2, where Paul speaks of "the third Heaven." In either case the Hebrew is more accurate than the English. Therefore, the apostle believed in three Heavens—the heaven of the clouds; that of sun, moon and stars; and that of the All-glorious Home of the Divine Presence. This third Heaven was created at an infinitely remote period—*long, long* before the planets and stars were rolled out into the infinite spaces.

This first verse of the Bible beautifully blends brevity and simplicity with sublimity, and is the finest possible introduction to universal history. Its accuracy of statement, its vast range of vision, its grandeur of conception, its profundity of meaning—all reveal the Infinite Author. The Almighty speaks and out of the fathomless abyss of nothingness, Nature in her splendor awakes into beautiful and fruitful existence.

Gen. 1:2: "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." It must be remembered that these first two verses describe events and conditions anterior to the work of the seven periods occupied in transforming chaos into cosmos. During long æons of time the earth was a molten mass. At length a crust began to form, but in the forming it was often broken up and tossed to and fro by powerful internal forces. Thus for long ages the surface of the earth was partly molten and partly solid, having multitudes of active volcanoes and extensive upheavals. But as time went on a more or less stable crust was formed. During this time "the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters." (R. V.)

This rendering is important, since the brooding, which is the meaning of the original, implies the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and shows that *Ruah* here signifies not wind or any blind force of nature, but the Third Person of the Glorious Trinity. Today the same Holy Spirit is brooding over a sin-cursed world, in order to change our vile chaos of evil into a beautiful cosmos of good,

THE FIRST PERIOD

Verses 3-5: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

"And God saw the light, that it was good and God divided the light from the darkness.

"And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first period."

The simplicity and sublimity of this account of light awakens in the soul the spirit of worship and adoration. That celebrated Greek critic and philosopher, Dionysius Cassius Longinus, who was born about 213 A. D., and who wrote a treatise on "The Sublime," although himself a heathen, thus speaks of this passage: "So likewise the Jewish Law-giver (who was no ordinary man), having conceived a just idea of the Divine power, expressed it in a dignified manner: Let there be light! and there was light—Let there be earth; and there was earth."—Longinus (Sec. 8, edit. 1663). This wonderful Genesis cosmogony has been the admiration of all ages.

The materials of the universe having been created, in due order follows its illumination. Matter is generally thought of as being opaque—as something that is not self-luminous. Light, accordingly, is a secondary consideration—is an addition, and consequently is distinctly mentioned as a separate manifestation of creative energy.

Light, heat and electricity are three most mysterious agents, and, probably were brought into existence at the same moment. Well may it be asserted that the marvels wrapped up in these three subtle forces preclude the possibility of a mere material origin, and render necessary a theistic explanation of the Cosmos.

In entering upon His great work of preparing the earth for human habitation, the Supreme Artificer inaugurates His constructive program by an illumination—by the creation of swift-winged light which travels at the rate of 186,000 miles per second. All this is perfectly scientific.

THE MEANING OF DAY

It ought to be said that our word Day has three meanings. It means the daylight period of 12 or 14 hours, the whole

period of 24 hours, and it also sometimes means a period of years. It is quite correct to say—In my grandfather's day was the war, in Luther's day was the Reformation, in the day of the kings of Judah, and so forth. Indeed, this very use of the word is found in the next chapter where it is said: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."—Gen. 2:4. Now this last day must have included millions of centuries. In like manner these creation days must have included long eras or periods of duration. Then, if the word period is used instead of day in these opening chapters, it will aid in understanding this glorious Revelation. Read: And the evening and the morning were the first period. In passing let it be remarked that evening and morning are the proper order, because chaos preceded cosmos.

Now, by using the word period, there is no difficulty in accounting for the vast geologic strata of our earth which must have required long æons of time for their formation. Also, there was time for the diversified and wonderful flora and fauna that flourished on this planet millions of years ago. Further, it aids in removing difficulties to remember that the matter of this globe—the chaos period—existed long before the work of the six days was commenced. That is, the first two verses of the Bible are merely the introduction and are no part of the six days' record—that record begins with verse 3.

Also, the Hebrew word for day is *yom*, and it has the same variety of meanings as our word. Like our word in Gen. 2:4, *yom* is singular and yet includes the vast æons of duration during which our earth was being transformed from chaos to cosmos.

Before proceeding, note that names are given by the Creator Himself to the times of darkness and light. From the mouth of the Lord came the words Day and Night, Earth and Seas. In this way the Heavenly Father aided man to construct a language. Since the Almighty talked with our first parents, He must have been the first to use speech with them, and in a little while Adam was able to give appropriate names to all the animals. In the Bible, therefore, is the

true account of the origin of language. God talked with man and gave him an understanding heart, so that in a short time our God-created ancestor was able to engage in conversation with his Maker. There has been a good deal of foolish speculation about the origin of speech. The agnostics refer to animals. But the parrot has always been able only to imitate certain sounds—and never anything more. The grinning monkey today chatters exactly as he did thousands of years ago—and never anything more. The Creator has wisely placed limits upon every species and every order in His infinitely varied creations—otherwise there never would have been a Cosmos, but a chaotic confusion of abortions and indescribable monstrosities.

THE SECOND PERIOD

Verses 6-9: "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

"And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

"And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."

The translators being misled by the Ptolemaic transparent-celestial-framework theory, unfortunately used the word firmament which is an incorrect translation of the original. Tregelles renders the Hebrew word *rakia* by the word *expanse* which is the first meaning of the word given by Davies in his Hebrew Lexicon and which does not imply an immense glass canopy, but lifts our thoughts to the open, boundless heavens of stellar spaces.

A further change should be made. In verse 6, the preposition between is better than the phrase, "in the midst of." Thus the Creator cleared an open *expanse* between the clouds and the cooling waters, cooling as the temperature of the earth lowered and allowed the condensing waters to rest upon its solidifying crust. Thus a wide open space was cleared, so that floods of light could flow in and illuminate and reveal the beautiful and variegated landscape.

These are not the operations of fate, or chance, or any blind forces of nature. It is God that has created the atmosphere and the waters, and that balances, controls and directs the forces of nature. "And God called the expanse Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."

THE THIRD PERIOD

Verses 9, 10: "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.

"And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called He Seas: and God saw that it was good."

While the crust of the earth was thin and hot, its great inner mass being still molten, of course our planet was almost perfectly round—almost without elevations or depressions. But as its temperature lowered the shrinking internal mass fell away from the outer rock formations, and then mountain ranges arose. Also, corresponding depressions would naturally appear, and in this way the Almighty prepared a bed for the ocean. As the cooling and shrinking go on, broad valleys and deep depressions, elevated islands and vast continents appear. All this is in accord with science.

Verses 11, 12: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

"And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good."

The previous events of the first two days pertain simply to the ordering and arranging of forces and materials already in existence. But now the Almighty again enters the realms of creative activity. During the long past eras, the earth has been stabilizing, the internal mass cooling and shrinking in size, mountains rising, ocean beds deepening and decreasing in extent, islands appearing and continents broadening and solidifying. Also, the blue expanse has been opening into clearer and vaster vistas of vision, and in the meantime the

crust of the earth has been thickening. Consequently, earthquakes have been decreasing in both number and violence.

Now the earth is ready for further creations, and the Creator, standing as it were, at the head of each species, speaks into existence the grasses, the herbs and the trees. Note the ascending order in these creations. Thus, when the earth is ready, vegetable life is created and planted by God Himself on suitable lands. This makes beautiful and fruitful the new and increasing areas of dry ground. Moreover the ocean beds are planted with vegetation.

Notice specially that each plant is said to propagate *after* its own *kind*. This fact is constantly emphasized. No less than ten times the word *min* is used, which according to Robinson's Lexicon means "kind, species." This word is found in singular and plural, in masculine and feminine forms. It is found once in verse 11, twice in verses 12, 21 and 24, and three times in verse 25. Indeed, it may be called the oft-repeated word of the chapter. We are told in v. 11 of "the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind"; in v. 12, of the herb yielding seed after his kind; in v. 12, of a "fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind"; in v. 21, of "every living creature, . . . which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind"; in v. 24: "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind . . . and beast of the earth after his kind"; in v. 25, this word *min* is used three times—"beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth . . . after his kind." Why does the Almighty tell us ten times in one chapter, the first in the Bible, that both plants and animals propagate after their own kind? This is the answer: The Almighty knew that wicked men would propagate this evolution craze which has disgraced the civilized world; therefore He has told His children ten times that His creative fiat stands at the head of every kind or species of both plant and animal.

Further, in this first chapter of the Bible the name of God is found no less than 31 times. Also, the expressions used are highly significant—"God said," "God made," "God created," etc. The Almighty thus repeatedly informs us that He is the Creator. Listen to His declaration: "I have made the

earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded."—Isa. 45:12. Throughout the Holy Scriptures the Lord is everywhere proclaimed as the universal Creator. He is the Almighty "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?"—Isa. 40:12.

THE FOURTH PERIOD

Verses 14-18: "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

"And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: He made the stars also.

"And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth.

"And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good."

The Bible does not say, "Let lights be created"; for long before this the sun and stars had been shining in their celestial realms.

In verse 14, J. M. Herschfelder's translation and note are helpful: "And God said, Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heaven." This is his note: "It is, let the luminaries now shine forth in their full splendor, and continue to do so. It will be seen there is no mention made of their being created; but like the *matter of light*, in v. 3, they are merely called upon to *appear*. The Hebrew word . . . luminaries is quite a different word to that which is used in verse 3, which denotes the element of light. The word employed means *light dispensers*." The meaning of the original is: Let the lights appear. That is, let the atmosphere be so cleared of mists and clouds that the solar splendors may kiss the earth into life and beauty.

In v. 15, it is said, "And let them be for lights." Davies in his Chaldee and Hebrew Lexicon suggests: "Let them serve for lights." The sun, moon, and stars are man's servants. They must guide the traveler through the wilderness and the mariner over the trackless waste of waters.

But in the early geologic eras there was neither day nor night, neither summer nor winter; for thick black masses of impenetrable clouds enshrouded chaos as a great pall of darkness. However, in the progress towards Cosmos, a time came when the sun was faintly seen and short days began to dawn upon the earth, and at length seasons were somewhat determined.

THE FIFTH PERIOD

Verses 20-22: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

"And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

"And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the sea, and let fowl multiply in the earth."

During this dawn era the warm earth, the warm waters, and the warm atmosphere produced a luxuriant and abundant flora and fauna. Great forests crowned the hills and vast flocks of birds filled the air, while mighty monsters sported in the deep. In this era coal and oil were stored in the earth for the use of man.

A fuller life was given to our planet. God smiled upon the new earth and made it both fruitful and beautiful. He carpeted the valleys with green and adorned the hills with monarchs of the forest. The tepid waters swarmed with shoals of fish. It was better for the young animal life to begin in the seas. They afford a wider domain, and in early eras when the crust of the earth was thin and unstable, and when atmospheric conditions were tempestuously unstable, the great oceans afforded a safer house. Therefore, the fish were created even before the birds. While hurricanes and cyclones may devastate a continent, the ocean depths are

comparatively quiet. Also, while temperature fluctuates rapidly on land, it is almost constant in the great waters. Besides, there is no water problem in the boundless oceans. La Conte is right when he states in his *Geology*: "The early seas literally swarmed with living beings," and he acknowledges: "It is impossible to overlook the apparent suddenness of the appearance of a new class—Fishes—and a new department—vertebrates—of the animal kingdom. . . . It is difficult to account for the enormous increase in the number, size and variety of fishes at the opening of the Devonian, unless we admit *paroxysms* of more rapid movements in evolution."—p. 358. The good fishes have had no paroxysms, but the weak-minded evolutionists are entering upon a chronic stage of paroxysms. Since those unscientific theories "survival of the fittest," "struggle for existence," "natural and sexual selection," do not explain the reliable records of the rocks, the perplexed professor is threatened with mental paralysis.

But Nature's stratified pages verify the inspired Word of Nature's Maker and also declare: "God created great whales and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind." Geology shows that the waters were ready for animal life before the land, and accordingly the Scriptures show that the Creator made the seas the birthplace of even the higher forms of life. These events following in logical order unmistakably indicate that a Supreme Intelligence shaped and directed all forces and materials to a wise and beneficent end.

Now, it is stated in verse 21: "And God created every winged fowl." By this time the air is comparatively clear, and sulphur vapors no longer filled the upper regions with noxious fumes. Then came the days of azure blue skies and brilliant nights when the marshalled hosts of heaven began to disclose the splendors of a boundless universe.

Yet, for ages the air was a safer home for animal life than the land. Igneous and aqueous rocks in broken and displaced formations give proof of cataclysmic disturbances when volcanic subterranean fires and ocean floods in continental convulsions struggled for supremacy. In these times of flood and conflagration, seas and islands changed

their places. But the cooling and the thickening of the earth's crust went on, and finally there was a suitable habitat for bird life.

The Berkeley geologist makes another assertion: "There can be," he says, "no doubt that Birds came from Reptiles," but honestly adds, "The time of their origin or separation from the reptilian stem is doubtful." *Doubtful*, he may well be. The infallible rocks have no record of the linking monstrosities—half snake and half bird. How could you blend a python and an eagle? Of course, the python could help by putting the eagle inside; but with the professor, we are *doubtful* about the feathers and the wings sprouting through and giving plumage and flight to the reptilian monster. Our learned scientist is afflicted with excessive unscientific credulity in accepting Evolution as "the central idea in geology."—p. 421. These great scientists have produced no examples of hideous reptiles changing their scaly or slimy skins into beautiful plumage. That transformation demands a *very lively imagination*.

But the thoughtful, scientific Christian, with Bible in hand, has a divine explanation to all these problems. To him the Almighty is the Central Force in Geology, and His Fiat stands at the head of each species, according to the Lord's own account of His creating activities.

Now, the atmosphere having become more settled and salubrious, and its temperature more equable, the earth is prepared for a further advance in animal life. The blue, ethereal sky is fully ready for its merry songsters. Henceforth, they will greet the rosy dawn and chant the evening hymn. Henceforth, the notes of the lark will make music in the air and the eagle's eye will range the landscape. And now the mundane preparatory work of the Most High is approaching completion.

THE SIXTH PERIOD

Verses 24, 25: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

"And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good."

At this time land animals were created; for the earth is prepared for the more highly formed species of animal life. We have seen that the waters were peopled first, then the air and now the land. All this has been in accord with the different stages of the earth's preparedness, and in harmony with the laws of nature—laws which the Almighty Himself has established. The waters were habitable in the earlier stages of the earth's transformation. Then while the crust of the earth was still rather thin and subject to sudden and great changes, the air became sufficiently stabilized for its feathered inhabitants. For birds of the air are much more independent than the beasts of the field. The former are much swifter in flight, and rivers and seas are no barriers to them. They can migrate from country to country and follow the sun and the seasons. During convulsions which have rent this planet, when earthquakes have shaken its very foundations, and when tidal waves have swept over vast land areas—even under such circumstances the winged songsters have been able to fly away and find places of shelter and safety.

But now the stabler conditions have come, and the All-Wise Being sees fit to create the beasts of the field that they may minister to the wants and comforts of the human race. In all countries and ages domestic animals have been the willing and obedient servants of man, aiding him in his hardest labors. And the earth is now prepared for its lord and master.

Verse 25: "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good." Mark these clear and definite statements: "God made the beast of the earth after his kind." The Revised Version puts this statement in the plural—"the beasts of the earth after their kind." There is here no room for evolution in these passages—no room for the agnostic vagary or for that hypocritical, so-called theistic heresy. The record emphatically declared that He—not any previously existing plants—that He, Himself, made them and so made them that each kind would propagate exclusively after its own kind or species. This account is definite, accurate, and scientific.

THE CREATION OF MAN

Verses 26-28: "And God said, Let us make man in our *image*, after our *likeness*: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

"So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.

"And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it."

Note the plural pronoun *us*. This accords with the plural name of God which is given throughout this chapter, and indeed throughout the Old Testament. Therefore, in reference to our creation, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit deliberated together. Is it not a delightful thought that the Holy Trinity, the Three Persons of the Godhead, were interested in our creation? The very idea that our first parents, Adam and Eve, were created by the Almighty is a great inspiration and a most blessed and happy thought. No wonder the children of God in all ages have greatly rejoiced in the Fatherhood of God, and no wonder that Satan and his children have waged increasing warfare against this Blessed Bible account of our origin in the Divine Fiat.

Listen again to the divine account. Verse 27: "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." But what do these words "image" and "likeness" mean? As God is a spirit, this likeness must be spiritual and not at all physical. Now, normal personality consists of four attributes; namely, an intellectual nature, an emotional nature, a volitional nature, and a moral nature. All agnostic psychologists always leave out the moral nature; and because they desire to ignore the divine God-ward side of our being. But it is a universal fact that man has a moral nature—has a conscience which is a moral sense and distinguishes promptly between right and wrong. God Himself is a moral Being, and this is a moral Universe, and if we were not moral beings we would not be fit to live in this Realm of the Holy One of Israel. Beings without a moral nature are just demoniacal. But the Good

Lord, in His infinite love, made us like Himself. *This is our Heavenly Birthright.*

We do not realize the infinite value of our God-created, Christ-redeemed and Holy Spirit-sanctified nature. One has well said: "The birth of a child is a greater event than the creation of a sun." Indeed, men are called gods. David says: "I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High."—Psa. 82:6. Also in Ex. 21:6; 22:8 and 9, *judges* are mentioned, but in the originals the word *Elohim*, gods is used. In any case, our creation in the "image" and "likeness" of God gives us vast significancy in the presence of angels and even in the eyes of our Heavenly Father Himself.

"Glory be to the Father and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

Further, this wonderful event is somewhat explained and confirmed by repetition in Gen. 2:7, where it is written: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The Almighty took some of the substances that form this earth and out of them He fashioned our bodies. The Psalmist has well said: "I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well."—Psa. 139:14. Our bodies are the workmanship of the Almighty. He fashioned our houses of clay so that they are of the earth earthy.

But in our creation there are two distinct acts of our Creator. He first fashioned "our earthly house of this tabernacle," which in due time is "dissolved," and then He "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul." In the original the word life is in the plural and should be read *lives*, and it means that God gave Adam at his creation, physical, mental and spiritual life—gave him all the attributes of normal personality. Also, originally man was created an immortal being. But in the Fall man lost the nobility of his nature and his glorious inheritance in the love of his Heavenly Father.

That man, the finest manifestation of creative power, wisdom and goodness in this mundane sphere, should appear when earth's development was completed, when this cosmic planet showed the finished work of the Divine Artificer, was most certainly in harmony with all the demands of science. According to Sir J. W. Dawson, "the order of creation as stated in Genesis is faultless in the light of modern science, and many of its details present the most remarkable agreement with results of science born only in our day." This Holy Book Divine was not inspired primarily as a text-book on Science. Its blessed aim and purpose are vastly more important than any scientific researches. While this Word of God is not a mere treatise on science, it is the most thoroughly scientifically constructed Volume in the possession of the human race. Read and study it and you will become wise unto salvation.

Begin again at the 18th verse of ch. 2: "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him an helpmeet for him." Then in the next verse it is said: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air." This is a very distinct statement and shows that the Fiat of the Almighty spoke into existence the first animals and first birds of every species. The apostle confirms this, when he states: "All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made. In Him was life."—Jno. 1:3 and 4. The Almighty is the only fountain of life in the Universe. He sustains moment by moment the very existence of the Universe.

This great truth is much emphasized in the first chapter which treats so minutely of the miracles of creation. These four words, "And God said, Let"—are repeated no less than eight times. In this way the Supreme Being is always and constantly presented as the immediate and present Creator. Consequently, to be an evolutionist a person must flatly deny the truth of the Holy Scriptures—must be an unbeliever, and most evolutionists are infidels. This man-dishonoring and God-denying heresy, having started with unbelieving heathen, has through all the centuries remained with the profane and the ungodly. Professor Townsend well says: "The make-

shifts resorted to by those who are seeking scientific and theological reconciliation are little less than confusing and often ridiculous."

In the 19th verse of this the 2nd chapter, it is stated that the Lord brought every kind of beast and fowl to Adam for him to name them, and in verse 20 we are told: "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field." By this time, no doubt, Adam had been so aided by God in acquiring a language that he was able to carry on a conversation with his Heavenly Father "in the cool of the day." Thus the Bible, the blessed fountain of knowledge and wisdom, reveals the divine origin of speech.

We now come to Eve, the great Mother of us all. It is stated in verse 20, that Adam gave names to all cattle and fowl but "there was not found an help meet for him." This shows that God Himself had fixed an impossible gulf between the brute creation and man. On this infernal evolution which implies and necessitates the commingling of humans and animals the Old Testament has a few appalling declarations. High Heaven and common decency abhor and with unutterable loathing this diabolical intercourse. It is too disgusting for either discussion or imagination. Let these Satan-inspired defamers and defilers of our Divine Humanity gloat their eyes on Ex. 22:19. Again, in unutterable language the God of Sinai denounces this abomination of all abominations, which descends to lower depths than even the Sodomites. Let our agreeable theistic evolutionists who believe in a spineless and backboneless, in a dementalized and headless gospel of gush—let them meditate on Lev. 18:23. And let everybody read this: "Defile not yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you." May the time soon come when all respectable people will regard evolution as too loathsome a subject for decent conversation. Most emphatically, in all the animal creation "there was not found an help meet for" Adam.

"And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;

"And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."—Gen. 2:21-23.

This Garden of Eden story is one of the most beautiful stories of all literature. Also, the setting of the story is historic and delightfully romantic. Now, for any one to imagine that the Almighty kept Adam waiting millions of centuries for his beautiful bride—for that rib by "sexual selection," or by "the survival of the fittest," or by the aid of old Father Time who, as a doer, is an absolute failure—for any one to imagine that the rib by any such delay or process became Eve, would be the height of absurdity. The whole trend of the story is that at once the Almighty created Eve out of the rib. Did not the Saviour, thousands of years after this out of "five loaves, and two fishes," feed "five thousand men, beside women and children"?—Matt. 14:17-21. The setting of the whole Garden scene, and all the concomitant circumstances attending the establishment of family life on this earth, demand our belief in the historic verity of this most auspicious and happy event—the first marriage in the human family. Probably, it was celebrated in the presence of the Holy Trinity and the holy angels.

It can, therefore, honestly be affirmed that the Sacred Volume gives a clear and truly historic account of the instantaneous creation of our Mother Eve, and that the first marriage was celebrated by the Good Lord Himself in the beautiful Garden of Eden which without doubt was the most delightful spot that ever adorned this beautiful world. Also, it may be that the angels sang some celestial song in welcoming our race into the heavenly fellowships. Our Blessed Lord Himself began His glorious ministry to earth by His first miracle at "a marriage in Cana of Galilee." "and manifested forth His glory."—Jno. 2:1 and 11. Here is an unmistakable proof of the instantaneous creation of the first woman. In obedience to the Creator's Fiat, Eve arose from the earth in the inexpressible beauty and glory of perfect womanhood. Her creation marked the completion of Heav-

en's blessed plans for this new and beautiful world. In all this science and Scripture are most perfectly and happily harmonized.

Our Heavenly Father is a lover of happiness and made a perfect Paradise for the first pair of human lovers. By this most happy event was marked the consummation of His terrestrial creations. This first marriage in the annals of time instituted the Family and inaugurated a divine race of immortals. In like manner the Saviour in entering upon His glorious work of human redemption also inaugurates His most blessed work by the marriage in Cana of Galilee.

From these blessed Christian thoughts and Bible scenes, it gives one a sense of shame and pain to be dragged down to the low level of Satan's explanation of the Cosmos. Sin in all its forms, social or mental, in wicked deeds and heretical thoughts—sin is repulsive and in its more pronounced manifestations in unrighteousness or unbelief is hideous.

But we should not forget to notice the remarkable passage in Gen. 2:4 and 5: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the epoch when the Lord God made the earth and the heavens. And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew." The Revised Version gives this negative rendering: "And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up." Both renderings recognize the fact that the Lord presents Himself as the Creator of every plant and of every herb. The repetition is significant and emphatic, and indicates that God for every species made a perfect plant and a perfect herb before it was planted in the ground. Here again evolution is entirely excluded. The Lord did not even plant seeds; but, according to the Holy Scriptures, He created and then planted the first specimen or specimens of each species. Let this irrational evolution be forever banished from all Christian thinking. But these demented evolutionists do not believe much in thinking. They prefer a decapitated Christianity. That best suits their illogical, unscientific, mindless vagaries.

There is no denying the fact that the Holy Scriptures absolutely disprove this agnostic abomination of Evolution.

WAS WESLEY AN EVOLUTIONIST?

In the following quotations we see what he says (1) about the monkey and the ape and (2) about God as the Creator of all. He has been quoted as favoring that old heathen and modern agnostic explanation of the Cosmos which made even man the result of the blind forces of nature. But that he entertained no such unphilosophical, unscientific, and abominably unscriptural notions, is abundantly proved by the following quotations which are taken from his *Philosophy*:

"We now come to a numerous tribe, that seem to make approaches even to humanity; that bear an awkward resemblance to the human form, and discover the same faint efforts at intellectual sagacity." He mentions that the monkey has "hands, instead of paws," that he has "ears, eyes, eyelids, lips and breasts" like those of mankind, that his "internal conformation also bears some distant likeness" and that "the whole offers a picture that may mortify the pride of such as make their persons the principal objects of their admiration."

These quotations merely show that Wesley believed that there is a physical side to our nature and that we should not bestow upon it the major part of our attention.

"These approaches," he says, "however, are gradual and some bear the marks of our form more strongly than others." He says further: "In the ape-kind we see the whole external machine strongly impressed with the human likeness; these walk upright, without a tail . . . have calves to their legs, feet nearly like ours."—Wesley's *Philosophy*, "The Wisdom of God in Creation," Vol. I, pp. 131-2. Edition of 1810.

Of course, we all believe with Mr. Wesley that the Almighty in His creations followed a gradually ascending scale in harmony with the cooling of the earth in becoming a fit place for man's habitation. But the very title of his philosophy, "The Wisdom of God in Creation," contradicts the false assumptions of his maligners.

In the following quotations, we shall see that Mr. Wesley was thoroughly sane on the all-important fact of the creation of each species by the immediate fiat of the Almighty Himself.

"And what a prodigious act it is of the Creator's indulgence [mark, he does not say of evolution] to the poor, shiftless irrationals, that they are already furnished with such clothing, as is proper to their place and business."

"God, in creating the first individual of each species, animal or vegetable, not only gave a form to the dust of the earth, but a principle of life." This is a very clear statement and proves that Wesley believed that the divine *fiat* stood at the head—at the origin—of every species.

"The same wise Being who was pleased to make man, prepared for him also an habitation, so advantageously placed, that the heavens and the rest of the universe might serve it both as an ornament and covering." Mark—*God made man*.

"The same Divine Ruler is manifest in all the objects that compose the universe." The universe is no evolution.

"The same Almighty power has created a precise number of simple elements, essentially different from each other, and invariably the same." That is, these elements are fixed in their nature—nothing changes its nature. The Almighty has fixed the laws of all things.

"In short, the world around us is the mighty volume wherein God hath declared himself."—*Ibid.*, pp. 276, 277, 279, 280-4.

One must always be on guard against unreliable propagandists of heresies. Notwithstanding the definite statements above, Mr. Wesley recently was most wantonly maligned. A person boldly asserted: "Were John Wesley alive today he would be considered a 'modernist' regarding evolution and the Bible." This derogatory statement is fully refuted by the foregoing quotations from his *Philosophy*, and abundant further refutation is found in his "Notes" on the New Testament. These Notes are among our Standards of Doctrine, and mark especially his Notes on the following passages:

Mark 10:6: "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." In his Notes on this passage Wesley distinctly says: "*From the beginning of the Creation*—Therefore, Moses in the first of Genesis gives us an account of things from *the beginning of the creation*. Does it not clearly follow, that there was no creation previous to

that which Moses describes? *God made them male and female.* Therefore Adam did not contain both sexes in himself, but God made Adam, when first created, male only; and Eve, female only. And this man and woman he joined together in a state of innocence as husband and wife." What could be plainer and more definite than the above statements? He certainly did not believe in this abominable heresy, that our first parents were the product of this vile evolution.

Romans 8:20. "The creature was made subject to vanity." Here, again, Wesley in his note mentions Adam, saying: "Adam only made it liable to the sentence which God pronounced." Most assuredly Wesley believed in the creation of Adam, and emphatically in the beautiful Genesis account of our creation.

Romans 8:21: "In hope that the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

NOTE—"The excellent state in which they were created." Therefore, Wesley believed in man's state of innocence. This certainly does not give his defamers any reason for their slander; that Wesley held unorthodox notions about Evolution and the Bible.

Col. 1:16-17: "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."

Mr. Wesley in his Note uses this expression: "The several species of which are subjoined." *Mark, he specifies species.* This ought to silence these deluded evolutionists and propagandists. Thus he believed that our Lord created not only heaven and earth, but all things—persons and angels contained therein. In Wesley's day only infidels in England and deists in France ever thought of such an absurdity as evolution. Its invasion of the Church is of recent date.

Col. 1:23: "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." NOTE—"Is already begun to be

preached to every creature under heaven." The founder of Methodism believed that we were the creatures of God. Some that were not founded and settled in the Gospel have fallen into miserable agnosticism. This is a recent event, and may it soon pass away.

Heb. 2:7, 8: "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." Mr. Wesley remarks: "That is, next to God. Such was man as he came from the hands of his Creator: it seems, the highest of all created beings." Here we see that Wesley regarded man as the noblest creature of God, and emphasizes the fact by speaking of man as *coming from the hands of God. He never imagined that some hairy animals aided the Almighty in bringing our First Parents into existence.* He believed that man came into existence in the Garden of Eden, and not in a jungle mudhole. In passing, it should be remembered that in Wesley's day only infidels and atheists committed this mental whoredom with materialism. Like a sane man Wesley accepted God's account of our creation as given by Moses, and not Satan's account as given by Darwin. The statement that Wesley believed in Evolution is a fair sample of the fallacious assumptions of these *scientific (?) deceivers*. They are perfectly reckless in their assertions.

Heb. 4:13: "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight." Note—"It is God in whose sight every creature is manifest." According to Mr. Wesley, God is not an absentee Deity. We are His creatures, and if we love Him we are "in the hollow of His hand," under "the shadow of His wing"—we are to Him as "the apple of His eye." We are always in God's sight.

Jas. 1:18: "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures." Mr. Wesley says: "Christians are the chief and most excellent of His visible creatures." He did not believe that we were begotten according to the will of mindless and base-born beasts, but he did believe that we were begotten, created, according to the blessed will of the most High, Him-

self. These wicked and insane evolutionists must stop their base slandering of John Wesley, who was one of the best and greatest men that ever lived.

Rev. 4:11: "Thou hast created all things, and through thy will they were and are created." NOTE—"Creation is the ground of all the works of God." "*And through thy will they were*—they began to be. It is to the free, gracious, and powerful working will of Him who cannot possibly need anything, all things owe their first existence; *and are created*—that is, continue in being ever since they were created." Mr. Wesley not only believed that the Supreme Being created all things, he also believed that the Almighty momentarily continued all things in their existence.

Rev. 10:5, 6: "And the angel . . . swore by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein." NOTE—"And consequently as the sovereign power over all." Therefore, the angel comprises . . . heaven, sea, and earth, and makes all depend on the eternal God and Almighty Creator, and Wesley believed in God as the Universal Creator, *and this excludes agnostic evolution.*

In the present crisis of thought on this degrading subject of godless materialism, it becomes all Christians to protest against this prostitution of the human mind before deified beasts. The Egyptians rendered divine honors to animals; so do the evolutionists of our day. God deliver us from this modern monstrosity of old heathen idolatry!

MAN A RECENT CREATION

These evolutionists in desperation are trying to prove man's antiquity. Venerable savants and ponderously learned science professors will compass sea and land to view *scientifically* some rotten tooth or rib or skull, and will officially announce to the learned world that the recent find is a most valuable find and gives a further advance to science, which gives us *noble* ancestors that propagated in forests and jungles thousands of decades in the dim vistas of antiquity. But in a little time the delusion dies away, and the *links* of sand are no more.

"And the alertness with which evolutionists have seized upon anything favoring the antiquity of man has numerous and interesting illustrations, some of which are too threadbare to repeat. In 1854, for instance, excavations in the valley of the Nile, brought burnt brick and pottery from a depth of more than seventy feet. Assuming that these relics had been made by the hand of man and were left where they were found, and that the alluvium had been deposited at the same rate at which the Nile now deposits, it was calculated that those finds were from twelve to sixty thousand years old. But Sir Robert Stephenson afterward dug up a brick in the delta near Damietta, at a still greater depth, bearing the stamp of Mahomet Ali, 1808. Some one has facetiously remarked that the main question therefore should have been, not how long it would take the Nile to deposit sixty or seventy feet of alluvium, but how long it would take a brick to sink sixty or seventy feet in a quagmire."

"We have seen already that though there has been an almost constant tendency among the more careful investigators to bring man's origin from a remote period down to comparatively recent times, yet there are those who still pronounce in favor of the great antiquity of the human race, in spite of this adverse tendency."—The B. C., Nov. and Dec., 1917.

"A skeleton was once unearthed in an alluvial deposit of the Mississippi delta which set the sociologists all agog with hope. 'Here,' they said, 'is an indubitable case of remote antiquity. These remains were found beneath successive layers of sand, gravel and clay which could not possibly have been deposited in less than fifty thousand years.' *Quod erat demonstrandum*. 'Let us go on excavating,' they said; 'who can tell what wonderful things we may happen on?' Unfortunately the wonderful things they happened on further down were the remains of a Mississippi flatboat.

"The futility of such efforts, repeated over and over a thousand times, ought to satisfy any unprejudiced mind that Evolution as 'a working theory of the universe,' is not only unproved, but unprovable."—The B. C., May 24, 1924, p. 242.

Job, in speaking of God as Creator, said: "His hand formed the crooked serpent." How much rather would His loving hands form man whom He made in His own "image" and "likeness"!

CHRISTIANITY IS SPREADING

Not only on this side of the Atlantic, but on the other side of it, the Kingdom of Christ is extending its blessed influences. Last April, in London, England, there was "A Great Demonstration for the Bible." There is evidently "an advance movement along the whole line of the sacramental hosts of God's elect." For in the heart of man there is an innate idea of God.

"The meeting was on a cold, wet, stormy night in Albert Hall, which is seated to hold about 10,000 people; it was packed full, and 700 had to be turned away. Every ticket was sold a week before the meeting. So far as I could see, the majority were young men; young women were next, and a moderate minority were old people or elderly. This and the enthusiasm of the audience were the most striking features. At the door, when we went in, one hour and ten minutes before the meeting began, there were crowds waiting, begging for any spare tickets."

"That does not look as if conservative Christianity in Great Britain were declining. The meeting was called 'a great demonstration in support of the full inspiration of the Bible.' One of the speakers termed it 'the greatest demonstration on behalf of evangelical religion ever held in London.' From the Sunday School Times we quote again:

"The Rev. A. E. Carter, Acting President of the Movement, states that the arranging and organizing was made delightfully easy by the hearty response from representatives of all sections of the Christian Church—men of science, literary men, missionary societies, groups of prayer unions, of professions, and commerce. Upon the platform more than fifty missionary and other societies had their official representatives, and there were scores of ministers and laymen of all denominations, including the editors of several religious journals. When the last speaker, Dr. Dinsdale T. Young, proposed to condense his address to two minutes on account of the late hour, the enthusiasm, which had been

'almost boisterous' throughout, manifested itself again in an insistent appeal that he should 'go on.'

"The eminent Assyriologist, Dr. A. H. Sayce, wrote as follows :

" 'There is no better way of impressing upon the general public the fact that a skeptical attitude towards the records of the Old and New Testament is today usually the mark of ignorance or semi-knowledge. The leading scientists have returned in great measure to what may be termed the traditional views on the subject, and nowhere is this more strikingly the case than as regards the historical records of Scripture. Archaeology, based on scientific excavation, has demolished the assumptions and conclusions of subjective criticism, and it is not going too far to say that the archaeological discoveries of the last thirty years have, with hardly an exception, been favorable to Christianity.' "—B. C., April, 1924.

TRUTH AND ERROR

O thou unholy spirit of Error!
 Let mighty Truth disdain all terror,
 Expel from Earth thy cowering visage,
 And now arrest thy pestering pillage;
 For Error aims at our desecration,
 But blessed Truth is man's elevation.

Error has no horizon. There is no inspiration in its morning gloom, no illumination in its meridian height, and its evening shades deepen into "the blackness of darkness forever." It is an *ignis fatuus* rising from malarial solitudes and sepulchral abodes. In philosophy it leads to pessimism, in science to mental aberration and in theism to infernal heresy. Men forget that laws are as much a creation of God as matter.

CHRISTIANS SHOULD BE THOUGHTFUL

Happily this Satanic explanation of the Cosmos with its vociferations and untruthful assumptions has never been accepted by any Christian Church; but it has deluded certain mentally unstable institutions of learning, and thereby has done an irreparable injury to the rising generation. Among seekers after truth there are many pretenders who are really seeking to destroy the truth. They talk loudly about being

broad-minded and open-minded. They can well afford to be such; for their mental possessions are worse than worthless. But the noble-hearted Christian's mind is the garden of the Lord, full of choice fruits of the Lord's planting, and must be protected against the ravaging beasts of the evil one; for gardens are different from deserts. Further, this loud, open-minded boastfulness is generally in the interest of error. The wicked want the lovers of truth to open their mental gates that all manner of uncleanness and unrighteousness may enter in and devour and destroy the peaceable fruits of righteousness. The Christian must always be on guard against the wiles of the devil.

When we consider that evolution has always had its origin among agnostics and the more benighted heathen; that it is utterly without any philosophical foundation; that it is absolutely unscientific, and infernally unscriptural; and that its influence not only upon the rising generation, but also upon its propagators, is degrading and demoralizing, it becomes the imperative duty of all good citizens to renounce and denounce this crying abomination, and as Christ drove clean animals out of the temple, how much more should Satan's unclean hairy beasts be driven out of our Christian Churches and schools!

At the present time there is dire need for all Church and school authorities to drive this vile "doctrines of devils" (I Tim. 4:1) out of all pulpits and class-rooms, and to purge our fair land from this vileness. Let all lovers of truth and youth unite in a holy crusade for the restoration of the Bible to its place of honor and influence in the schools and colleges of the nation, and for the eradication of this loathsome mental leprosy which has recently become a world calamity. Only in Christ is there healing for this deadly disease.

CONCLUSION

"So God created Man in His own Image."—MOSES.

THE LOATHSOMENESS OF EVOLUTION

The discerning Japanese traced their origin up to the gods; and the Greeks and Romans had anthropomorphic deities. These were sometimes lured by earth's fairest and there came even a race of demigods. But an unutterable loathing will ever rest upon the memory of Sodom. Yet, it appears, it was reserved for European and American agnostics, in their mad search for an animal ancestry, to descend to the lowest possible depths of degradation. They follow Empedocles, according to whom there were "heads without necks, arms without shoulders." "Then as these fragmentary structures met, there were seen horned heads on human bodies, bodies of oxen with men's heads," and figures indescribable. Here were monstrosities—human-animal and animal-human. Our godless agnostics have followed their ancient patron saint down to the lowest possible depths of unutterable humiliation! Evolution degrades with horrible ancestors.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION

Forever, then, let this sanctimonious subterfuge of Theistic evolution—forever let it be under High Heaven's anathema. The very idea that the Almighty called in the aid of unclean animals in creating man in His "image" and "likeness" is too despicable for discussion. How erroneous and disgusting is this tadpole ancestry and mudhole habitat! When our Creator Himself informs us: "Men are made after the similitude of God."—Jas. 3:9. Solomon uttered the truth: "The thoughts of the wicked are an abomination to the Lord."—Prov. 15:26. Also this vilest of all iniquities is well described by the great apostle: "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies."—II Peter 2:1.

Yet some will contend for Theistic Evolution. Does it not push God out of the Universe? Is it not surely anti-Christian and infidel? Perhaps not! But there are many writers today of no small eminence in the scientific world, who assert that, as a matter of fact, Theistic Evolution is a contradiction of terms. They say that if it is Theistic it is not Evolution; if it is Evolution, it is not Theistic.

"The Theistic Evolutionist may accept Evolution and shake hands with Darwin, Spencer and Huxley, if not with Haeckel, and in an effort to be abreast of modern thought he may even say: 'Sirs, let there be no strife between us and you, for we are brethren in the great theory of the origin of the world and man!' But no pure evolutionist can accept a creative act, for he does not accept either God the Creator, or the Word of God which declares Him."

"From an article entitled 'The Riddle of Evolution,' which appeared in the Times, of London, June 9, 1905, we take the following:

"No one possessed of a sense of humor can contemplate without amusement the battle of evolution, incrimsoned (dialectically speaking), with the gore of innumerable combatants, encumbered with the corpse of the (dialectically) slain.

"Strange to say, there has been slight recrudescence of this pedantic tomfoolery in the last decade. Fortunately, this has been confined to the schoolmen, and is strictly an academic performance. That the deadly doctrine of Darwinism will again be given serious thought, is not believed by any one of the great scientists. And this prompts us to say—we do not deny the right of any man to hold that he came, by protoplasm, through spontaneous generation, to his present state of existence, but we do most emphatically deny the right of such a one to call himself a Christian. It is absolutely impossible for anyone to believe the doctrine of the origin of life and species, as taught by Darwin, and at the same time believe the Bible. The history of Creation, as given in Genesis, and as held by Darwin, are unconditional and irreconcilable opposites. One is true, and the other false, and if we accept the one, we are forced to reject the other; pro-

vided, of course, our mental machinery is in good working order."—The B. C., May and April, 1918.

IGNORANCE

Little black Topsy in her dense slave ignorance was a fine evolutionist. When Miss Ophelia asked: "Do you know who made you?" she said: "Nobody as I knows on; I spect I growed. Don't think nobody never made me." This ought to be treasured as a scientific specimen of spontaneous evolution.

How true are the words of the old prophet: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."—Hosea 4:6.

It has been well said by Shakespeare:

"Ignorance is the curse of God;
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to Heaven."

Likewise the evangelical prophet predicts: "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times, and strength of salvation."—Isa. 33:6.

Great Bacon in his quaint way has uttered a great truth:

"It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth man's mind back to religion. For while the mind looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together it must needs fly to Providence and Deity."

It is evident that the two great sources of this disgraceful mental aberration of some so-called scientists are these: (1) Just ancient and modern, common ignorance of the real facts of science; (2) The "carnal mind" of the unregenerate man is in revolt against divine verities and against divine goodness.

Darwin himself made honest confessions like the following:

"With respect to the causes of variability, we are in all cases very ignorant."—Descent of Man, p. 28.

"We are profoundly ignorant of the causes of each sudden and apparently spontaneous variation."

Since *variability* is the whole problem, we are all in "profound ignorance" concerning the very foundation of evolution.

Even Huxley had to admit: "Of the causes which led to the organization of living matter, it may be said that we know absolutely nothing."

Sir Charles Lyell, the celebrated geologist, makes these two remarkable statements:

"The laws of nature do not account for their origin."

"Our ignorance of the laws of nature is profound."

THE DECLINE OF EVOLUTION

James Orr, the distinguished Scotch professor, says: "The greatest scientists and theologians of Europe are now pronouncing Darwinism to be absolutely dead." Also, "Sir Charles Bell, professor of University College of London, etc., etc., speaks thus concisely but clearly: 'Everything declares the species to have their origin, not in a gradual variation from some original type.'"—Collapse of Evo., p. 52.

Down through the whole range of sciences this is distinctly written—*Evolution Absurdity*. Did plants invent a heart for animals? Did the polyclads or the triclads pass up improved and multiplied eyes for insects? Did apes enlarge and improve brains for human beings? Verily, verily, the only sane explanation of the works of God is found in the Word of God. Therefore the only true verdict on this scienceless abomination is simply—Evolution is a delusion of Satan.

The Christian churches in this country are beginning to realize that materialism is bound to exercise a terrific influence for evil on the rising generation.

Dr. Robert E. Speer of New York, at a recent Synod of the Presbyterian Church in this city in a notable address, declared: "Evolution is repudiation of the Gospel." That is the *note* which, it is hoped, will be sounded in every evangelical church and college throughout Christendom. Such doctrinal preaching does not weaken or split the Church; but it strengthens, unites and saves the Church. Neither the evil one nor his servants like doctrinal preaching.

During last year the Question put to the Minnesota Ministers by *The Literary Digest* was:

"Is the theory of evolution unsound and should it be banned from our educational courses? The replies were 115 to 77 against teaching evolution."—L. D., for Jan. 13, 1923. Pity the Churches that are fed on evolution!

In Canada an influential voice has been raised against this godless materialism. Rev. Dyson Hague, D.D., LL.D., Wyckliffe College, informs us: "Nearly all, if not all, of its originators have been men who do not believe in God or the Bible, and a vast number of its champions are men who do not believe in God the Creator, or accept the teachings of the Word of God." Also, he said: "The Dawn Man is simply a specimen of modern mythology, invented by our present day agnostics."

The last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in San Antonio, Texas, and in Ten Fine Statements declared its firm faith in the great verities of our Holy Christianity, and reaffirmed its stand against evolution. A committee recommended the following declaration:

"The church remains at this time sincerely convinced that the Scriptures as truly and authoritatively expounded in our Confession of Faith and catechisms teach:

"Adam and Eve were created body and soul by immediate acts of Almighty Power, thereby preserving a perfect race unity:

"That Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God without any natural animal parentage of any kind and of matter previously from nothing."

There is no better sign of spiritual vitality in a Church than its godly zeal for "the truth as it is in Jesus." Mental lethargy on doctrine is a sure sign of backsliding. This miserable delusion of Satan that it matters little what a man believes is really in some instances decapitating the Church and is making spineless Christians that are "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive."—Eph. 4:14. Nothing pleases the arch deceiver more than a lazy-minded, doctrineless ministry. God desires us to have "*the mind that was in Christ.*" But according to Satanic wisdom, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion."

Moreover, "this wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish."—Jas. 3:15.

EVOLUTION MANIFESTS DEPRAVITY

This Evolution is a proof of the mental and moral insanity of man. The unregenerate wish to avoid the Divine Presence—wish to avoid the Lover of mankind. Here is the sad secret of all this fallacious materialism. When I was about twelve years of age and under deep conviction for sin, one pleasant day when out hunting with a gun and a fine Scotch collie dog, I distinctly remember that as the handsome animal leaped about and barked with exuberant spirits, feeling on my heart the sad burden of sin, I felt a wish to change places with the dog so as to get rid of my responsibility before the Great Judge. *Here is the secret source of this miserable materialism*—indeed, infidels claim that they have no souls—claim that they die as the beast dieth. Why? Because they dread the Judgment Day.

We forget that the Lord has put great dignity on man: "For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands."—Psa. 8:5, 6. Now, sin, mental and moral, physical and spiritual, is the sorrow and shame of our fallen humanity. All these miserable heresies have their root in "the carnal mind" which "is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God."—Rom. 8:7, 8. Also, the previous verse utters a great truth: "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."

Where the thoughts of the unregenerated on moral and spiritual questions are carefully considered, the sad fact is more fully realized that the Fall of our First Parents was a most appalling calamity causing the death of the body, the corruption of the heart and the demoralization of the imperial faculties of the mind. Our Blessed Lord was right when He repeatedly declared to Nicodemus, a religious ruler of the Jews: "Ye must be born again."—John 3:7. This second birth, being "born from above," being "born of the Spirit," being recreated and restamped with the divine "image"—this

new birth is an absolute necessity. For sin has wrought ruin in our whole nature, and the only hope of humanity is in the Atonement by the Son of God.

CREATION

Come, Thou mighty God of love,
Dwelling 'mid the stars above.
Absolute, eternal Power,
Blessed goodness is Thy dower.

Let the light of morn appear,
Showing Holy Spirit's near,
Brooding o'er the vasty deep,
Where old chaos tempests sweep.

Now is God creating worlds,
Planets into space He hurls.
Uncreated Lord Supreme,
King of Kings is seraphs' theme.

Great Arcturus lighting sky,
Greater Sirius reigning high,
Circling Milky Way so vast—
These are works of ages past.

Realms all are God's domain,
Peopled spheres aloud proclaim,
Men and angels His delight,
Suns created by His might.

Oh! Thou glorious Prince of Peace,
Let Thy joys on earth increase.
Thee, the spacious heavens adore;
We, Thy mercy would implore.

God created all from naught.
Christ our souls from sin hath bought.
Blessed Spirit, sanctify—
Three in One, the Lord most high.

"The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

"But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"—Matt. 6:22, 23.

"Yea, I thought it impossible that ever I should attain to so much godliness of heart, as to thank God that He had made me a man." "The beasts, birds, fishes, etc.; I blessed their condition." "I could have rejoiced, could my condition been as any of theirs."—Page 39.

"Yea, gladly would I have been in the condition of a dog or horse, for I knew that they had no soul to perish under the everlasting weight of hell or sin, as mine was like to do."—Page 41.

Bunyan says in "Grace Abounding": "Oh! how glad now would I have been anybody but myself—anything but a man."—Page 47.

"A man educated in mind and not in morals is a menace."—Roosevelt.

FINIS

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

336891

THE WORLD PROGRAM

ACCORDING TO THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES

By REV. ALEXANDER HARDIE, A.M.

A thoroughly readable and instructive volume from the pen of a thoughtful and well informed student of the Gospel, "The World Program" deserves a place in every library in the land.

It deals most conclusively with many of the difficult problems which confront the Church today.

The following letter from Bishop Berry, of Philadelphia, is one of the many letters of approval received by Rev. Hardie on this and previous publications relating to this subject.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Bishop's Office, 1701 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

December 21, 1923.

Rev. Alexander Hardie, D.D.,
Los Angeles, Cal.

My dear Dr. Hardie:

I thank you for the advance pages of your book. You have written in your usual incisive and convincing way and I have no doubt that your strong presentation will be read with very great interest. These are times when such logical and forceful statements as you make are very much needed. I predict that your seed-sowing in this case will produce the hundred-fold harvest.

Sincerely,
(Signed) Jos. F. Berry.

PRICE \$1.50

PUBLISHED BY
The TIMES-MIRROR Press
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

B2
263
H2

BL
1031
H3 Hartman, Louis Oliver, 1876-
 Popular aspects of oriental religions, by
 L.O. Hartman, PH.D. New York, Cincinnati, The
 Abingdon press [c1917]
 255p. front., plates. 21cm.

The first four chapters are based on articles
which appeared in Zion's herald, 1915. cf. Fore-
word.

"Reference books" at end of each chapter;
"General reference books": p. 246.

1. Religions.

I. Title.

336891
CCSC/jc

